DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 287	FL 010 702

TITLE	A Study of the State of Bilingual Materials Development and the Transition of Materials to the Classroom. A Final Report: LEA Survey, Volume 3.
INSTITUTION	Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 78
CONTRACT	300-76-0358
NOTE	136p.; For related documents, see FL 010 448 and FL 010 701 ; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Classroom Materials; *Federal Programs; *Instructional Materials; Language Instruction; *Material Development; Needs Assessment; *Questionnaires; Second Language Learning; Spanish; Textbooks; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS	*Bilingual Materials; Bilingual Programs; *Limited English Speaking Ability

ABSTRACT

This study describes and assesses the state of bilingual curriculum development activities in the National Network of Centers for Bilingual Education. Recommendations are made for improvement in the creation, production, and distribution of bilingual instructional materials. The overall approach to the study was tripartite and focused on: (1) the development of an inventory of bilingual instructional materials including, a variety of European, Native American (and Alaskan), and Asian languages; (2) site visits to Centers, commercial publishers, and distributiors to analyze their procedures for the development and distribution of materials; and (3) a mail survey of Local Education Agencies, equally divided between those in the Title VII program and those with other sources of funding, on their uses of bilingual education materials. This volume of the study deals with what materials Local Education Agencies were using, how they obtained these materials, and what their needs were. It also discusses how the existing system of publicizing and disseminating bilingual education instructional materials can be improved from a user's perspective. (Author/NCR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175287

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A FINAL REPORT

A STUDY OF THE STATE OF BILINGUAL MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT AND THE TRANSITION OF MATERIALS TO THE CLASSROOM

LEA SURVEY -- VOLUME III

Submitted To:

OFFICE OF PLANNING, BUDGETING AND EVALUATION
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted By:

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.
2924 Columbia Pike
Arlington, Virginia 22204

FL010702

October 1978

The work reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. The statement, findings, conclusions, recommendations and other data in this report are solely those of the Contractor and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Office of Education.

This report is one of several made pursuant to Contract No. HEW 300-76-0358. The amount charged to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for the work resulting in this report (inclusive of the amounts so charged for any prior reports submitted under this contract) is approximately $309,277. The names of the persons employed or retained by Development Associates with managerial or professional responsibility for this project and this report are listed below:

Mr. Peter B. Davis, Officer-in-Charge

Mr. Wilbur A. Knerr, Project Director

Dr. Norma Z. Chaplain, Senior Research Specialist

Dr. Malcolm Young, Senior Technical Advisor and Editor

Dr. Milton Goldsamt, Senior Research Advisor and Analyst

Ms. N. Elizabeth Arnow, Bilingual Curriculum Specialist

Mr. Adolfo Munoz, Field Survey Specialist

Mr. Tomas Torres, Field Survey Specialist

Ms. Jean Rogers, Editor

Mr. Warren N. Chapman, Editor

Mr. James R. Jones, Computer Programmer

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The acquisition of the data required for this report would not have been possible without the sincere cooperation Development Associates, Inc. (DA), received from many persons at every step of the way. From the public sector, invaluable assistance was provided by the management and personnel of the Office of Bilingual Education. Recognition should be given to the directors and staffs of the Title VII and Lau Centers who not only welcomed DA warmly, but spoke openly and candidly about their work. Special appreciation also should be given to the personnel of the many LEA's who, despite their heavy workload, took the time to answer DA's questionnaire with care and provided useful data and impressions. In the private sector, the publishers and distributors DA visited were equally kind in providing their time as well as comprehensive information about textbook publishing.

Finally, DA acknowledges the invaluable assistance provided by Mr. Tetsuo Okada, the Project Officer, who over the two years of the study made possible its smooth operation and provided encouragement and assistance whenever it was needed.

DEFINITIONS AND ACRONYMS

Definitions of key terminology used throughout the report volumes are provided below.

Bilingual Education Program

A program of instruction designed for children of limited English speaking ability to elementary and secondary schools. Within the program are the instruction and study of English and, when necessary to allow the child to progress through the educational system, the native language of the children is also included. In addition, instruction is interrelated with the cultural heritage of the students. Within the elementary school, bilingual education instruction is part of all courses of subjects in order to allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system.

Market (a geographical area of demand)

From the point of view of a Center or publisher, the potential group of U.S. students (and their teachers) enrolled in elementary, secondary, or higher education institutions that want, and are disposed to purchase instructional materials. Further market segmentation is made on the basis of users' characteristics and identification of relevant decision-makers for organizational units in the target market segments.

Market Research

The gathering of relevant information as to consumer preferences for goods and services.

Need

From the Network's standpoint, need seems to be a qualitative, not always quantitative, expression of interest by bilingual educators in a produce of service. A lack of something requisite, desirable, or useful . . . a condition requiring supply or relief.

Marketable

Fit to be offered for sale in a market . . . wanted by purchasers . . . salable.

Marketability

The quality or state of being marketable.

Market Value

The price at which both buyers and sellers are willing to do business.

A list of acronyms used throughout the report is provided below.

OBE	Office of Bilingual Education
LEA's	Local Education Agencies
TRC's	Training Resource Centers
MDC's	Materials Development Centers
DAC's	Dissemination and Assessment Centers
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
USOE	United States Office of Education
IHE's	Institutions of Higher Education
SEA's	State Education Agencies
BL	bilingual
BC	bicultural
DA	Development Associates, Inc.
LESA	Limited English Speaking Ability
LELS	Limited English Language Skills
LELP	Limited English Language Proficiency
NDEA	National Defense Education Act
SCDC	Spanish Curriculum Development Center

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction 1

II. Study Methods and Procedures 5

III. Need for Additional Material 25

IV. Improving the Current Dissemination System 49

V. Summary and Conclusions 71

VI. APPENDIX: Characteristics of Responding School Districts and Use of Bilingual Education Materials 76

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

For the past 200 years, the United States has been the home of peoples from every part of the world. These immigrant and Native American groups have brought with them a rich cultural and linguistic heritage that has formed the character of the country. Historically, most teaching of students, regardless of background, has been in English, although ever since colonial times there have been special schools in languages other than English. Until relatively recently, however, most public school teaching for students with limited English language skills ranged from merely placing the student in all English classes to giving formalized and extensive training in English as a Second Language (ESL).

With the growing awareness of the extent of its non-English speaking and limited English-speaking populations, bilingual education has become an area of increasing concern in U.S. educational policy and practice. Although it includes ESL as a component, bilingual education also provides for instruction in students' dominant languages.

Both as an educational concept and a formal program, the development of bilingual education was spurred on by the passage in 1968 of the Bilingual Education Act,* and attention and resources have been increased further in recent years by court decisions and the passage of state legislation.** Over the past decade there has been a marked increase in the number of schools and school districts with bilingual education programs, with the programs in some places supported federally and in others exclusively with state and local funds.

At the time the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII) was enacted, little material had been produced in the United States that was suitable for use in bilingual education classes. Materials published abroad were usually not relevant to the lives of American students and they often contained unacceptable religious, political or sexual biases.

Because of the scarcity in the original legislation, Congress authorized support for the development and dissemination of bilingual education materials. With the amendments to the Act in 1974,*** the authorization to produce bilingual education materials was reiterated. To accomplish this, the Rules and Regulations* associated with the 1974 amendments specified that federally supported activities could include support of a Network of three types of bilingual education centers: (a) Materials Development Centers, (b) Dissemination and Assessment Centers, and (c) Training Resource Centers. It was assumed that through this Network the needs of local school districts for bilingual education materials which were not being met by commercial publishers would be identified and filled.**

---

*Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1967. PL 90-247.

**For example: U.S. Supreme Court Decision 72-6520, "Lau vs. Nichols," 1974; and California's Chacon-Mascone Bilingual Bicultural Education Act, 1976.

***PL 93-380

Context of This Study

To assess the progress being made on bilingual education materials by the federally supported Network and others, the Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, Office of Education/HEW, contracted with Development Associates, Inc., in July 1976, for A Study of the State of Bilingual Materials Development and the Transition of Materials to the Classroom. This study was designed to (a) determine the availability of bilingual curriculum materials, and (b) to evaluate the processes of the Title VII Network in developing and disseminating materials and in training teachers in their use. This information would be useful to the federal government for planning and administering the bilingual programs.

The study consisted of three interrelated parts. First, an Inventory was made of bilingual education instructional materials developed in the U.S. for use in elementary and secondary classes. Second, site visits to Title VII Bilingual Education Centers were conducted to investigate their activities in the development, field testing, publicizing, and distribution of materials and the training of teachers. Third, a mail survey of school districts was made to assess the existing needs for materials and the functioning of the Network of Centers from an LEA perspective.

The three parts of the study expand and reinforce each other. Together they provide the data base for the development of a "Model Management Plan" that summarizes the present state of bilingual education materials, discusses priorities of needs for materials, and makes recommendations for improving the development and dissemination system.

---

*Federal Register, April 8, 1976.

**Throughout this report the term "Network" is used to refer to the three types of Title VII Centers. The term "Bilingual Centers," which is also used frequently, refers to the Title VII Centers plus those supported by HEW's Office for Civil Rights (Lau Centers). "Centers" (Capital C) refers only to projects and organizations funded by Title VII, and "center" (lower case "c") refers to either non-Title VII projects and organizations or to a combination of both (Title VII and non-Title VII).

The study is presented in three separate reports. One contains the Inventory of bilingual materials, and another the assessment of Centers, and the Model Management Plan. This, the third study report, summarizes the results of the survey of local school districts.

Objectives of the School District Survey

The survey of the school districts expands and reinforces the other parts of this study. While the Inventory reports on the materials that are available from domestic sources and the study of the Title VII Network Centers investigates the efforts made under Title VII funding to supply materials and to train teachers in their use, the school district study provides information from the perspective of the users of materials and services.

In broad terms the survey of school districts had two major purposes:

1. To estimate relative demands by school districts for various types of bilingual materials as a basis for answering the policy question: Should Title VII continue to support the production of bilingual materials and if so, which types of materials should be produced?

2. To provide information on how the system of disseminating bilingual education materials and supporting services could be improved from the perspective of their users.

More specifically, it addressed the following major areas:

- materials that are being used in bilingual education classes;
- materials needed and the extent of the needs;
- services received from Title VII Centers on information, materials and training; and
- suggestions for improving the system of development and dissemination of bilingual education materials.

Overview of Methods and Limitations

The investigation of materials and services for bilingual education programs in local school districts was a one-time mail survey sent during September 1977 to bilingual education project directors at local education agencies. A sample of school districts was chosen that would yield approximately even numbers of bilingual education projects funded by ESEA Title VII funds and bilingual education projects funded only by other sources. A total of 312 districts receiving Title VII funds was chosen from a universe of the 425 school districts receiving Title VII funds through the Office of Bilingual Education/HEW during FY 1977.

The 312 school districts with Title VII programs were matched closely as possible in language and geographical region with school districts not funded by Title VII. Information for selecting non-Title VII school districts received from State Education Agencies, the National Catholic Educational Association and special census data obtained from the Office of Civil Rights/HEW.

After the initial mailing, several attempts were made to contact survey non-respondents. As a result, a total of 399 (60.4%) of the 661 school districts that had been sent survey forms responded. Of these 284 (71.2%) had bilingual education projects and otherwise were suitable for analysis. They included 173 from Title VII projects and 111 from projects supported only with other funds.

As discussed in the following chapter, various factors combined to impose important limitations on the study. In essence, the limitations were due to a combination of the diverse nature of the Title VII universe, the highly limited information on the universe of projects not funded by Title VII, and a range of methodological problems inherent in using a one-time mail survey to capture detailed information on a complex topic from respondents who have no legal obligation to participate. These problems combined with the survey response rate preclude generalizing statistically from the survey data to the universe of Title VII or non-Title VII projects. Nevertheless, a qualitative assessment of the responses combined with some limited statistical comparisons of respondents to known characteristics of the universe (e.g., Title VII language categories) suggests that the data reported in the chapters which follow are generally representative of conditions in the field.

CHAPTER II. STUDY METHODS AND PROCEDURES

A. Purpose and Scope

As mentioned earlier, the purpose of this study was to determine what materials LEA's were using, how they obtained these materials, and what their needs were. An ancillary objective was to determine how the existing system of publicizing and disseminating bilingual education instructional materials could be improved from a user's perspective. Within this framework, certain research questions were considered worthwhile to address. These were:

- What types of bilingual education project instructional materials are being used, and from what sources (locally, commercially, by Centers, etc.)?
- For what grades, subjects, and in what languages are these materials being used?
- What instructional materials do bilingual education projects need, for what grades and subjects, and in what languages?
- Does the current state of bilingual materials development and its corresponding levels of need for instructional materials vary with the particular language?
- Regarding the existing system of publicizing and disseminating instructional materials, how do school officials become aware of materials? What information do they need most to make decisions to adopt or purchase particular materials?
- What is the role of, and relative use of services offered by Title VII Centers?
- Do bilingual education projects use the system differently, based on the language involved and source of funding (Title VII or non-Title VII)?
- What suggestions do bilingual education projects have for improving the materials dissemination system?

These policy issues and research questions were investigated by developing a comprehensive mail survey questionnaire which was distributed during September, 1977, to bilingual education project directors at local educational agencies. The mailing was to samples of both Title VII and non-Title VII projects, the latter for comparison purposes. Since the purpose of the study dealt with current levels of materials usage and needs rather than trends in such usage, the self-administered survey was a one-time data collection effort.

B. Instrumentation

The topical content for the instrument was based on the Office of Bilingual Education (OBE), United States Office of Education (USOE), goals for Title VII-funded bilingual education projects in the area of materials development and this project's objectives. Actually, this survey was part of a larger study which included the development of an Inventory of currently used instructional materials, an analysis of procedures for field testing, publicizing and disseminating bilingual materials both by Title VII Centers (i.e., Materials Development Centers, Training Resource Centers, and Dissemination and Assessment Centers) and commercial publishers. A final objective of the overall study was to synthesize and summarize information concerning the state of bilingual education materials development, and to design a Model Management Plan for bilingual materials development and dissemination. Thus, the survey was intended to supply information which directly meshed with and complemented the overall study goals.

The survey instrument was designed to deal with the following areas: materials being used; materials being developed; needs for additional materials; dissemination of information and materials; and the characteristics of the respondent school district/LEA and its students. Because of the policy implications of the survey goals and the wide diversity of bilingual education projects, their instructional materials and Title VII projects per se, an unusually large number of knowledgeable and relevant federal and non-federal agencies, organizations, and individuals were consulted for their inputs into the survey content and its methodology. The four LEA's contacted for this purpose also reviewed draft versions of the survey instrument to verify its practicality and completeness. Table 1 lists the agencies, organizations and individuals (by title) with whom meetings were held during the survey instrument development phase of the work.

A series of definitions of key terms were provided so that respondents would use a standardized or common frame of reference in providing information. These definitions were modifications and simplifications (as useful for the sake of readability) of those used by OBE, NCES (for example, those used in its recently issued report, State Education Agencies and Language-Minority Students, NCES 78-239) and in relevant federal legislation.

TABLE 1. Organizations, Agencies and Individuals Contacted During the Survey Development Process

- Federal Agencies
  - Office of Education:

    Office of Bilingual Education, Office of Indian Education, Associate Commissioner for Equal Opportunity Programs, Equal Opportunity Programs (Lau Centers), Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Associate Commissioner for Compensatory Educational Programs, Division of Education for the Disadvantaged, Migrant Branch of Office of Education, Director of Refugee Assistance Task Force, Title VI NDEA
  - Other Agencies:

    National Institute of Education (Research Chief-Multicultural/Bilingual Division), Office of Child Development (now ACYF; Bilingual Coordinator), Bureau of Indian Affairs (Education Division), Library of Congress (Network Development Office)
- Local Educational Agencies - Arlington County, Virginia; Montgomery County, Maryland; Fairfax County, Virginia; New York City Board of Education, New York
- Non-profit Educational Organizations - Center for Applied Linguistics (Native American, Bilingual, Indochinese, and other representatives); Proyecto Leer (Director)
- Universities - University of Maryland (College of Library and Information Services)
- International Organizations - Organization of American States (Chief Librarian, Department of Educational Affairs)
- Title IV Centers - Lau General Assistance Center (Teachers College-Columbia University, Associate Director)
- Title VII Centers - Regional Bilingual Training Resource Center (Brooklyn, New York, Director); Northeast Center for Curriculum Development (Bronx, New York, Director)
- Publishing Firms - McGraw-Hill (Director of ESL and Foreign Languages); MacMillan Company (President and Senior Vice President); Litton Educational Publishing Company (President of American Book Company, Marketing Director of International Operations; and Editor of English as a Second Language materials); Regents Publishing Company (Vice President of Bilingual Operations, Vice President of Marketing Operations); Harper and Row Publishers (Director of Product Marketing-School Department, Vice President of International Division, Marketing-International Division)

The terms defined* were: Bilingual Education, English as a Second Language, Bilingual Education Centers, Home Language, and Students of Limited English-Speaking Ability.**

The survey instrument was deliberately designed to be semi-structured in light of the large quantity and diversity of bilingual education instructional materials being used in the United States. Rather than using structured item formats having a series of pre-established response categories, by which each respondent is forced to supply information in only those formats (except for a miscellaneous "other" category), the survey designers attempted to gather a maximum amount of information -- in a format which might more readily fit the actual pattern of materials usage, needs and actual LEA operating program/languages. It was believed that by doing so, a more accurate and global picture of materials usage and market estimates could be obtained. This decision to use a semistructured response format was therefore a trade-off between: (a) obtaining information in the respondent's own context and gathering the most salient information to that respondent, and (b) the additional effort required to provide that information by writing out the response rather than selecting combinations of already-provided categories. This response format may well have affected the response rate as will be discussed in a subsequent section of this chapter.

The semi-structured format used asked the respondent LEA project director to supply:

- statistics on the actual number of students in LEA's who were: LES, in bilingual education projects as either LES or English-proficient, in ESL projects, and who could potentially be served by needed instructional materials (these statistics were requested for each language program and grade level involved);
- the single basic text, curriculum guide, filmstrip, etc., which was most used in the classroom for each language, subject and grade level;
- the single most important source of information and source of bilingual curriculum materials (commercial publishers, bilingual education centers, other school districts, etc.);

---

[*] All definitions are included with the survey form at the end of this report.

[**] This term recently was replaced by the term Limited English Language Skills (LELS, rather than LES); its meaning essentially remains the same, although the terminology has been altered.

- bilingual and ESL materials - their language, subject and grade level which were either locally developed or presently unavailable;
- total annual (1975-76 and 1976-77) estimated expenditures for bilingual curriculum materials, for each language; and
- names of bilingual education centers with whom the LEA had been in contact during the last 12 months.

As mentioned above, the semi-structured format used for the survey instrument was considered, on its relative merits, to be most useful for the survey goals, given the diversity of materials usage and bilingual education projects.

Following a review by the four LEA's, a pretesting phase then occurred by mailing the questionnaire to six additional bilingual education project directors at LEA's not included in the samples selected for the study data collection effort. These LEA's were located in: Arvin, California; Commerce City, Colorado; Bridgeport, Connecticut; Imokalee, Florida; Taos, New Mexico, and Bishop, Texas. Respondents receiving the form by mail were therefore in a pretest situation which was identical to the conditions of the larger, actual survey. Forms typically required 45 minutes to complete, but varied from 30 to 75 minutes depending mainly on the number of individual schools on which data has to be supplied. (This latter factor may also have played a role in the non-response rate, as will be discussed more extensively later.)

Based on pretest results, minor revisions in form design and content were made; and the survey form, together with a full justification for its use, were submitted to the U.S. Office of Management and Budget and received approval.

In summary, then, the final form of the instrument dealt with the following topics (a copy of the survey questionnaire is bound at the end of this report):

- Characteristics of LEA's
- Bilingual Education Program Characteristics
- Materials Being Used in LEA's
- Sources of Materials
- Materials Developed by LEA's
- Bilingual Materials Needed
- ESL Program Characteristics
- ESL Materials Needed
- Expenditures for Bilingual Materials

- Authority for Adapting and Purchasing Materials
- Services supplied by Title VII Bilingual Education Centers
- Suggestions for Improving Development and Dissemination of Bilingual Education Materials and Related Comments
- General Comments

C. Survey Respondents

Surveys were mailed to the bilingual education project director in each LEA. For some LEA's the survey respondent was a project coordinator or a similar responsible official.

D. Sampling Strategy

The sampling approaches used mirrored the survey goals, and sought to assume that information was gathered from Title VII and non-Title VII funded bilingual education projects, and from projects which spanned a variety of languages and materials usage/need levels. To achieve these goals, a series of probability sampling approaches were used, with specific sampling criteria, as described below.

In essence, a stratified random probability sample of Title VII projects was drawn and a sample of non-Title VII projects were matched as much as possible to that Title VII sample. Overall, a total of 312 LEA's receiving Title VII funds was chosen from the award universe of 425 LEA's receiving Title VII funds from the Office of Bilingual Education during FY-77; thus, the sample represented 73.4% of all LEA's funded in FY-77. A sample of 349 non-Title VII projects was also chosen, but from a universe of unknown size. The two samples of Title VII and non-Title VII projects were chosen so that they were of comparable size. The actual sampling processes were conducted first for Title VII projects, then for non-Title VII projects.

1. Selection of Title VII Projects

Three stages were used, with sampling being conducted within each. In the first stage, all 142 projects in languages other than Spanish were included (a 100% sampling rate). That is, all projects in languages other than Spanish were included to insure adequate coverage in French. Portuguese, Italian, Japanese, Vietnamese, Korean, Pilipino, Chinese, Greek, Haitian French, and Native American languages. In the second stage, projects with predominantly Cuban populations (as one of the three major cultural groups of Spanish projects, the others being Mexican-American and Puerto Rican) were selected at a 100% sampling rate; thus, all predominantly Cuban population projects were included in the Title VII sample. In the third stage, a 50% probability sampling rate was used as a means of selecting 164 of the remaining 277 Spanish projects. To obtain a representative sample from this stratum, projects were listed in alphabetical order by state, and then city within each state. A random number between 1 and 277 (i.e., the last-listed LEA) was used as the selection starting point; every other project then was selected from the list of 277 until all 164 projects were chosen. In sampling terms, a systematic random sample was drawn. The sampling rate of 50% was chosen for convenience to reach the desired number of Spanish projects within that stratum; alphabetizing the projects before conducting the sampling process minimized the chance of including projects which were geographically concentrated (e.g., those in California and Texas) in the sample at a disproportionate rate. Instead, the Title VII sample was geographically dispersed.

2. Selection of Non-Title VII (Other) Projects

The sample selection process for non-Title VII projects was not as straightforward. To begin with, no listing of the universe of suitable bilingual education projects was available from OBE or other sources, as it was for funded Title VII projects. Instead, a series of screening activities had to be conducted to assemble listings of LEA's who potentially operate with bilingual education projects; the latter then were used to locate LEA's which could be optimally matched with LEA's in the Title VII sample.

The sources which were used to locate non-Title VII bilingual education projects were the following. A pool of 26 formerly funded Title VII projects was used as a known source of operating bilingual education projects. Furthermore, the Office of Civil Rights directory of operating public school systems (for 1973, the most current source available at the time of the sample selection process) was used in computer printout form to select LEA's with the largest percentages of particular ethnic groups of students. This was the largest single source of potential projects available. However, the OCR directory acted as an approximation, since the ethnic categories used by OCR were those arising from the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and not those used in bilingual education legislation, and it is possible that some LEA's having non-Spanish (and in particular, the less common languages) projects were missed. The final source used was the data bank of diocesan operated school systems which is maintained by the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA). School systems which reported some type of bilingual training were selected. The NCEA data bank was used to widen the breadth of materials needs which might be expressed by projects included in the non-Title sample. In summary, the attempt to find non-Title VII projects as suitable respondents for the survey questionnaire and its content was a difficult one.

3. The LEA Matching Process

The non-Title VII projects (or likely "candidates" to have such projects) were matched as closely as possible with the already-selected sample of 312 Title VII projects. The matching process was based on several factors which were used in sequence. Language was the primary factor, and was used first with the pool of 26 formerly funded Title VII projects: 24 of the 26 were Spanish, the remaining two were Navajo, Zuni and Portuguese. Other potential non-Title VII projects then were reviewed for their suitability as matches. In general, matching on the basis of language was relatively easy for Spanish and fairly difficult for non-Spanish projects. For example, no matches were found for the Title VII funded projects in the Pacific Trust Territories included in the sample.

After matching on language, geographic location was used; nearby cities were used within a state wherever possible to increase the precision of the match. Where a match within a a particular state was not possible, then a match within the Training Resource Region was sought. Other factors to be used in the project matching process were considered but were discarded as being unfeasible due to insufficient information about them; one such factor was whether the project emphasized (i.e., the number of students in its program) elementary or secondary school levels. Thus, the two samples may have differed on this necessarily uncontrolled-for factor.

A total of 312 non-Title VII LEA's were selected as matches for the already-selected Title VII sample of 312. The non-Title VII sample then was supplemented by a form of over-sampling, adding an additional 10% (or more precisely, 37 LEA's) to compensate for the likelihood that certain LEA's might not be suitable respondents for the survey. The 37 LEA's which were included in the non-Title VII sample were those which generally were similar to those already included (i.e., with fairly high percentages of non-Spanish students, likely to have some form of bilingual training being offered, etc.). Thus, a total of 349 non-Title VII projects comprised this sample. Including the 312 Title VII LEA's, a total of 661 LEA's were mailed questionnaires.

4. Data Collection Activities

Prior to the first mailing, separate letters were sent to the superintendents of schools in each LEA and were signed by John W. Evans, Assistant Commissioner, OPBE/OE. Letters from Ernest L. Boyer, Commissioner of Education, had been sent August 15 to Chief State School Officers informing them of the study. Both of these letters were on government stationary.

On September 7, 1977, DA mailed two survey forms to the selected LEA's, with a cover letter signed by the DA project director, and a return envelope. The packets were addressed by name to the Title VII project directors and to "Project Director" for the non-Title VII LEA's. Franked return envelopes were included.

On September 28, 1977, three weeks after the initial mailing, DA sent Mailgrams to all project directors whose responses to the survey had not been received. Followup letters were mailed two weeks after the Mailgram to all non-responding projects. The second mailing contained two copies of the survey form and a copy of the original letter to the project directors, as well as a new letter soliciting cooperation in the study.

Five school districts that sent letters requesting further information about the survey were contacted by telephone for this purpose, and five districts that requested copies of forms were mailed additional packets shortly after that contact.

5. Processing of Returned Survey Forms

The date of return of each survey form was recorded on a master list of all LEA's in the Title VII and non-Title VII samples, and on individual cards for each LEA. The cards for returned forms were placed in a separate file so that two separate and continuously-updated files were kept on returns and non-returns.

E. Survey Response Rates

The types of LEA's returning questionnaires were analyzed in a number of ways to determine the overall response rates, the response rates for each of the samples and for each of the sampling strata, and in a general sense to determine the extent of returns from particular language groupings and Training Resource Center Regions. With this information it was possible to determine the extent to which survey returns were representative of the probability samples drawn and the target populations, thereby permitting generalizations about materials usage and needs to be drawn with some degree of confidence. Other related analyses were conducted to understand the types of respondents' characteristics.

Turning to the actual response rate statistics of the 661 LEA's which were mailed survey questionnaires and then were followed up as needed, an overall total of 399 (60.4%) responded. This level generally represents a minimum level of acceptable or usable response for mail surveys, and initially suggests that the generalizations from the mail survey information should be guarded ones. However, this overall response rate does differ, based on what subset of samples or respondents are being considered, as indicated by Table 2.

Over 57% of the Title VII sample reported bilingual education programs and returned surveys. Five additional returns were considered unsuitable to analyze as they lacked projects. These LEA's represent a segment of the Title VII universe which should not have been sent a survey, and by including these 5, 59.0% of the full Title VII sample of 312 projects responded. Excluding these five and two projects whose followup Mailgrams were returned (perhaps indicating improper addresses for the originally mailed survey), the Title VII "suitable response rate" was 58.7%.

Following the same logic for the 349 non-Title VII projects, 32.4% responded with suitable surveys (i.e., reported having bilingual education programs). Including those who lacked such programs (explained in footnotes accompanying Table 2) the overall response rate for non-Title VII projects was 61.6%, which declines to 46.1%. The assumption is made that the 102 LEA's who responded and did not have bilingual education programs were not truly part of the non-Title VII universe and should not have been sent a survey form. This assumption, of course, is a tentative one, being based on partial knowledge, and it also illustrates the problems involved in sampling non-Title VII projects (and methodologically, the problems involved when a sampling frame of relevant projects from which to draw a sample cannot be accurately determined).

Turning to the three Title VII sampling strata used in this survey, the response rates were lower than those stated above. The two Spanish project strata rates had a response of 50% or higher; the combined Spanish LEA response rate (of Cuban, and non-Cuban yet Spanish) was 51.8%. However, some of the non-Spanish Title VII LEAs also operated Spanish programs. Thus, a total of 190 non-Spanish programs were found to exist, of which the 111 responding LEAs represented 58.4%. The Other European group of French, Greek, Italian and Portuguese programs, of which there were 62, contributed 41 returns to the survey, a rate of 58.7%. Thus, there was some variation in response rates, although the median response rate would appear to be about 60%.

TABLE 2

SURVEY RESPONSE RATES BY RESPONDENT CATEGORIES

SAMPLE	RESPONDENTS	NO. LEA'S	% SAMPLE
TITLE VII (N = 312)	Suitable to include and analyze	173	55.4
	Suitable to include but received too late	6	1.9
	TOTAL SURVEY [3]	179	57.4
	Unsuitable to include[1]	5	1.6
	TOTAL RETURNED OF FULL SAMPLE	184	59.0
	Total returned, excluding unsuitables, and 2 Mailgrams not received by LEA's (implying survey did not, either)	179	58.7
	Non-Spanish Title VII (N = 142)	85[2]	59.9
	Cuban Title VII (N = 6)	5[2]	83.3
	Spanish/Non-Cuban Title VII (N = 164)	83	50.6
	Total Spanish (Cuban and Non-Cuban)	88	51.8
OTHER (N = 349)	Suitable to include and analyze	111	31.8
	Suitable to include but received too late	2	0.6
	TOTAL SUITABLE[3]	113	32.4
	Unsuitable to include (ESL only[4] = 24; LEA's without programs = 78)	102	29.2
	TOTAL RETURNED OF FULL SAMPLE	215	61.6
	Total returned, excluding unsuitables, and 2 Mailgrams not received by LEA's (implying survey did not, either)	113	46.1

[1] These include four regional programs mainly providing training, technical assistance, and other support services to several LEA's. The fifth return not analyzed is a Title VII project reporting that it did not have a bilingual education program and that there were only three students with limited English language skills in each school in the LEA.

[2] Some LEA's in this category also operated Spanish programs; thus a total of 111 non-Spanish programs and 124 Spanish programs were represented by the 173 responding LEA's.

[3] Total number of respondents considered suitable to include in data analyses = 399 (60.4% of all contacted).

[4] These LEA's had ESL programs for their students with limited English language skills, but did not have bilingual education programs as such.

From another perspective, Title VII LEA's responding to the survey and those that did not were analyzed for differences in languages and by their locations within Title VII Training Resource Center (TRC) Service Regions (Tables 3 and 4). There was no statistically significant difference in the distribution of language categories. However, the regional distribution of respondent and nonrespondent Title VII LEA's did differ. A major factor in this difference was the underrepresentation of returns from New York City (43.6% returned) and California (43.8% returned) as compared with the returns from all suitable to include Title VII districts (57.4% returned). Because language distributions were considered more crucial than regional differences for most analytical purposes, no attempt was made to compensate for any regional bias by post-stratification or other weighting techniques. However, it should be noted that four of the eight TRC regions had 70% or more of the Title VII LEA's in those regions which responded. Results, therefore, are considered moderately generalizable to TRC Regions 1, 3, 5 and 8. However, LEA's in these four regions represent only 47.4% of all responses; thus, the overall findings should be generalized cautiously.

The month in which survey forms were returned was also considered. This factor was not significantly related either to (a) the total number of students with limited English language skills in the LEA or (b) to the number of students in the bilingual education programs, for Title VII and non-Title VII LEA's. Consequently, both early and late responses from the two samples were considered a single body of data (see Table 5).

Three other tables bear on the characteristics of the responding LEA's. Tables 6 and 7 indicate the LES student distributions of individual languages within the five language groupings (Spanish, Other European, Asian, Native American, and Other) used for presenting the survey results. In both of these, the wide diversity of responding programs' languages is apparent and implies that some measure of general representativeness is present. Table 6 presents the distribution of languages for LES students in the LEA's and Table 7 presents the distribution of bilingual education programs by language group.

In passing, it should be noted that the overall response rate may have been depressed by a parallel survey being conducted by the Dissemination and Assessment Center (Austin, Texas) which dealt with materials use and which was mailed to some of the same Title VII project directors at a time that overlapped the present study. Since some of that study's survey questionnaires were returned to this study, it is possible that the two survey goals were confused by survey recipients who chose to complete only one. The extent of this effect on response rates is difficult to estimate.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGES OF TITLE VII RESPONDING AND NON-RESPONDING PROGRAMS BY LANGUAGE

	Responding		Non-Responding		Total
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	
Spanish	71.7	124	72.7	101	225
Other European*	23.7	41	15.1	21	62
Asian	15.6	27	13.7	19	46
Native American	13.9	24	12.2	17	41
Other[xx]	11.0	19	15.8	22	41
Unstated	4.6	8	6.5	9	17
Number of Languages Reported		243		189	432
Number of LEA's		173		134	307

* French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

xx "Other" languages listed in Table 6, p. 20.

chi-square = 4.397,
$p > .50$ (statistically nonsignificant)

TABLE 4

RESPONSE RATES OF RESPONDING AND NON-RESPONDING TITLE VII PROJECTS BY TRAINING RESOURCE CENTER REGIONS

Region	States Included	Response Rate (%) By Region	Responding		Non-Responding	
			Percent	Number	Percent	Number
#1	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont	77.8	8.1	14	3.0	4
#2	New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands	45.9	16.2	28	24.6	33
#3	Alabama, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia	70.6	6.9	12	3.7	5
#4	Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin	50.0	2.9	5	3.7	5
#5	Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas	71.9	26.6	46	13.5	18
#6	Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming	52.6	5.8	10	6.7	9
#7	Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Trust Territories	46.2	27.7	48	41.8	56
#8	Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington	71.4	5.8	10	3.0	4
	Number of LEA's			173		134*

*Five non-respondents could not be included in this analysis.

TABLE 4

MEAN NUMBER OF STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS BY MONTH OF SURVEY FORM RETURN AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	TITLE VII PROJECTS		OTHER PROJECTS	
	Mean No. of Students	No. of Projects	Mean No. of Students	No. Of Projects
September	1113.18	39	433.80	15
October	1160.71	93	671.25	59
November	2070.35	20	372.50	20
December	1824.24	21	355.44	16
TOTAL		173		110*

*No data Available on one LEA.

NOTE: This factor is not significantly related either (a) to the total number of students with limited English language skills in the LEA, or (b) to the number of students in the bilingual education programs, for Title VII and non-Title VII LEAs.

TABLE 6

LANGUAGES OF STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS BY TYPE OF FUNDING

	TITLE VII		OTHER PROJECTS	
	Number of LEA's	Percent of Category	Number of LEA's	Percent of Category
1. Spanish	124	100	100	100
2. Other European	48	100	15	100
French	12	25.0	5	33.3
Greek	8	16.7	1	6.7
Italian	14	29.2	4	26.7
Portuguese	14	29.2	5	33.3
3. Asian	73	100	18	100
Chinese	18	24.7	3	16.7
Japanese	2	2.7	2	11.1
Pilipino	5	6.8	0	0
Tagalog	5	6.8	0	0
Vietnamese	24	32.9	9	50
Cambodian	1	1.4	0	0
Korean	13	17.8	2	11.1
Laotian	2	2.7	0	0
Asian (unspecified)	3	4.1	2	11.1
4. Native American	27	100	7	100
Apache	1	3.7	1	14.3
Athabaskan	1	3.7	0	0
Choctaw	2	7.4	0	0
Creek	1	3.7	0	0
Crow	1	3.7	0	0
Hualapai	1	3.7	0	0
Inupiaq	1	3.7	1	14.3
Keres-Acoma	1	3.7	1	14.3
Miccosukee	5	18.5	0	0
Mohawk	1	3.7	0	0
Navajo	4	14.8	3	42.9
Ojibway	1	3.7	0	0
Puma	1	3.7	0	0
Tewa	2	7.4	0	0
Ute	0	0	1	14.3
Yupik	3	11.1	0	0
Central Yupik	1	3.7	0	0
Upper Tanana	1	3.7	0	0
5. Other	23	100	8	100
Armenian	1	4.3	0	0
Arabic	4	17.4	2	25
Burmese	1	4.3	0	0
Haitian French/Creole	4	17.4	1	12.5
Hebrew	1	4.3	0	0
Hindi	0	0	1	12.5
Kapingamarangi	1	4.3	0	0
Marshallese	1	4.3	0	0
Nukuoran	1	4.3	0	0
Pennsylvania German	0	0	2	25
Ponapean	1	4.3	0	0
Punjabi	1	4.3	0	0
Russian	3	13.0	0	0
Samoan	2	8.7	2	25
Yiddish	1	4.3	0	0
Number of LEA's Responding	173		111	

NOTE: Does not include 14 Title VII and 9 Non-Title VII programs with fewer than 10 students in their respective LEA's.

6

30

TABLE 7

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Language Category	TITLE VII		OTHER PROJECTS	
	Number of LEA's	Percent of Category	Number of LEA's	Percent of Category
1. Spanish	124	100	93	100
2. Other European	41	100	10	100
French	10	24.4	2	20
Greek	5	12.2	0	0
Italian	12	29.3	5	50
Portuguese	14	34.1	3	30
3. Asian	27	100	5	100
Chinese	8	29.6	0	0
Japanese	1	3.7	0	0
Pilipino	4	14.8	0	0
Tagalog	1	3.7	0	0
Vietnamese	6	22.2	4	80
Cambodian	1	3.7	0	0
Korean	4	14.8	0	0
Laotian	1	3.7	0	0
Asian (unspecified)	1	3.7	1	20
4. Native American	22	100	4	100
Apache	1	4.5	1	25
Choctaw	2	9.1	0	0
Creek	1	4.5	0	0
Crow	1	4.5	0	0
Hualapai	1	4.5	0	0
Inupiaq	1	4.5	1	25
Keres-Acoma	1	4.5	0	0
Miccosukee	2	9.1	0	0
Mohawk	1	4.5	0	0
Navajo	4	18.2	1	25
Pima	1	4.5	0	0
Tewa	2	9.1	0	0
Ute	0	0	1	25
Yupik	3	13.6	0	0
Central Yupik	1	4.5	0	0
5. Other	18	100	3	100
Arabic	3	16.7	1	33.3
Haitian French/Creole	3	16.7	1	33.3
Hebrew	1	5.6	0	0
Kapingamarangi	1	5.6	0	0
Marshallese	1	5.6	0	0
Nukuoran	1	5.6	0	0
Papago	1	5.6	0	0
Pennsylvania German	0	0	1	33.3
Ponapean	1	5.6	0	0
Punjabi	1	5.6	0	0
Russian	4	22.2	0	0
Samoan	1	5.6	0	0

With respect to the non-responding LEA's, because the characteristics of neither the non-Title VII universe nor the sample are known, specific language projects could not be attributed to the school districts that did not respond. Further, almost half the non-Title VII districts that responded to the survey did not have bilingual education programs. This lack of information about the universe of non-Title VII programs prevents confident generalization of some findings in this study to a larger population. The comparisons made between Title VII and non-Title VII programs, while plausible and consistent, should be treated as suggestive rather than conclusive of any differences found. Similarly, generalizations to the universe of Title VII projects should be done cautiously, although statements about Spanish projects are more plausible than those about non-Spanish projects.

F. Data Management Procedures

Survey forms were edited first for completeness and consistency between items. Items also were coded, one at a time, for all forms. A copy of the Editing and Coding Manual accompanies this report.

Written instructions were given to the keypunch supervisor about format and there was independent verification of all keypunching. Further, validation of the coding and keypunching was made by machine editing the punched cards for out-of-range responses, consistency between items, means and median levels, and completeness.

After the extensive editing of the mail survey returns, data were stored on computer tapes for a series of analyses which were conducted by using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 7, and FORTRAN computer programs, which were specifically written as needed.

G. Data Analyses

A series of analyses were conducted on an item-by-item basis, then for related groups of items. Frequency distributions, percentages and cross-tabulations formed the major types of analyses which were conducted for subsets of responding LEA's such as, Title VII vs. non-Title VII comparisons, or for the five groups of language categories. The latter generally represents natural patterns of languages which also had sufficient numbers of responding LEA's to permit analyses. The five categories were: Spanish (including Spanish-English), Other European (i.e., French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese), Asian, Native American and Other.* The specific languages which were grouped in this manner appear in Tables 6 and 7. Specific features of the overall methodology are presented with the survey findings; in some cases, the percentages presented total more than 100% due to multiple responses being feasible on that survey item.

---

*The other category did not include English as a Second Language projects. These were extracted from most analyses and specifically identified when included.

H. Limitations of the Survey Findings

In summary, there are a series of factors which affect the generalizability of the results and some of these are interrelated. Furthermore, some of them arise from the overall methodology used, thus making any comparisons with other published sources of Title VII material needs tentative. The major considerations are:

- This was a one-time survey - Thus, trends in materials development and progress in meeting LEA's detected needs were not measured; retrospective questions which summed up a series of events over a period of time were not used as perhaps introducing memory bias; however, discrete and more reliably measured contacts with bilingual education centers over the past year were queried in this fashion.

- A mail survey data collection mode was used - Personal interviews, site visits and other indepth data collection approaches were considered beyond study resources and study objectives; however, such a study could conceivably be useful as a follow-up given the present study scope, the levels of mail survey response which were obtained, and the wide diversity of Title VII projects. The mail survey approach also necessarily imposed limits on the depth of questioning, due to practicalities in respondent burden.

- The topic of materials development usage is highly diverse, as are the bilingual education programs per se - The survey topics dealt with here spanned a wide variety of dominant languages, materials, grade levels, and even the philosophies underlying the very implementation of a bilingual education program.

- The very nature of a bilingual project is highly diverse - Thus, it was difficult to capture a true "snapshot" of the Title II universe. Similarly, the non-Title VII universe was difficult to identify due to having imperfect proxy measures of the presence of a bilingual education program. The matching approach for making comparisons across Title VII and non-Title VII projects, which was used in an effort to improve the generalizability of the non-Title VII findings, was confounded by diversity of the projects.

- Compromises in survey item style were necessary - This occurred for such survey topics as asking about the "single most widely used" material. A tradeoff needed to be made between richness of information, as on an open-ended format, and the ease of aggregating information across respondents if the item had been asked in a standardized (closed-end) format. Thus, post-data collection response-based categories were used. For large school districts, the relatively larger effort for administrators in assessing what the single most widely used material was for particular languages, grades, and subjects may have introduced survey bias, omissions, and perhaps even non-response. However, the relatively high percentage of open-ended comments (about 30%) indicates that those who did respond were quite interested in the goals of the survey and the planning role of the information.

- The response rate for most segments of the two universes of projects which were sampled was about 60% - This had been discussed at length earlier in this chapter and appears to be due to a variety of interacting factors, some of which are fundamental to the topic being measured and type of program being contacted. However, the diversity of individual languages included in the survey respondent group, the spread of respondents across Training Resource Regions, and the lack of bias in the date when respondents did return a survey document indicates that the findings are meaningful in describing the patterns in the materials usage and development area.

The remainder of the survey report, therefore, is devoted to a focussed presentation of survey findings which address the study objectives.

CHAPTER III: NEED FOR ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

The first of the two major purposes of the survey was to investigate the need of school districts for various types of additional bilingual education materials. Underlying this purpose were the important questions of whether or not Title VII should continue to support the development of bilingual materials and, if so, what types of materials should be produced. While it was recognized from the start that the survey of school districts could not provide definitive answers, it was correctly assumed that it would provide information and insight of use in grappling with these concerns.

The approach to this aspect of the study provided for gathering information on what available materials were in use as well as information on expressed needs for additional materials. The meshing of the two types of data permits some insight into the nature of the needs expressed; that is, it provides understanding of the intensity as well as the extent of needs for various kinds of bilingual materials.

As a preface to the results of this aspect of the survey, Table 8 provides a summary of salient respondent characteristics. As previously discussed, while the constraints on the study's scope and procedures prevent statistical extrapolations of needs for bilingual materials, the respondents are generally representative of LEA's with Title VII projects and of many LEA's with bilingual programs supported by other funds as well.

A. Materials Being Used in Bilingual Education

During the 1976-1977 school year, the reported costs for bilingual education instructional materials ranged from a median of $5,995 for Spanish projects funded by Title VII to a median expenditure of $830 in Asian language projects funded from sources other than Title VII. On a per-child basis, the median expenditures for bilingual instructional materials ranged from $16.44 to $8.93. As would be expected, this constituted some increase over the amounts expended the preceding school year. The expenditure levels per program and per child varied somewhat by type of language. A summary of the data reported for the 1976-1977 school year is presented as Table 9.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF RESPONDING SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE OF PROGRAM AND TYPE OF FUNDING AND NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN RESPONDING SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY ENGLISH LANGUAGE ABILITY, TYPE OF PROGRAM AND TYPE OF FUNDING

RESPONDENT POPULATION	TYPE OF FUNDING		
	TITLE VII PROJECTS	OTHER PROJECTS	TOTAL
SCHOOL DISTRICTS			
Number with Bilingual Programs	173	111	284
Number with ESL Programs	92	58	150
Total Number Responding	173	134	307
STUDENTS IN RESPONDING DISTRICTS			
Total Number of Students with Limited English Language Skills	194,817	54,661	249,478
Total Number of Students in Bilingual Education Programs	160,848	55,272	216,120
- Number in Bilingual Education Programs with Limited English Language Skills	103,698	33,085	136,783
- Number in Bilingual Education Programs Proficient in English	57,150	22,187	79,337
- Number in Spanish Programs: Grades Pre K-6	115,815	46,000	161,815
Grades 7-12	19,696	5,737	25,433
- Number in Programs Other than Spanish: Grades Pre K-6	17,688	2,508	20,196
Grades 7-12	7,649	1,027	8,676
Total Number of Students in ESL Programs	53,669	7,785	61,454
Total Number of Students with Limited English Language Skills Not in Special Programs	37,450	13,791	51,241

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF 1976-1977 EXPENDITURES FOR BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

LANGUAGE	TITLE VII PROJECTS				OTHER PROJECTS			
	Median Per Pupil	Range Per Pupil	Median Per Program	Number of Respondents	Median Per Pupil	Range Per Pupil	Median Per Program	Number of Respondents
Spanish	$12.25	$ .45-$88.20	$5,995	87	$12.77	$1.50-$77.54	$3,000	59
Other European Languages*	$16.44	$ .28-$54.55	$2,500	25	$11.77	$1.54-$63.16	$ 850	7
Asian	$ 8.98	$1.33-$57.14	$1,225	10	***	***	$ 830	3
Native American	$ 8.93	$2.68-$62.78	$5,110	9	****	****	****	1
Other**	$10.64	$6.32-$70.00	$1,800	18	****	****	****	1

*French, Greek, Italian and Portuguese

**"Other" Languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

***Per pupil data was not available for these projects.

****The amount reported by the one responding Native American Project was $49,000 or $50.62 per pupil. The amount reported by the one "Other" Project supplying full data was $2,500 or $3.91 per pupil.

Survey responses indicate that most decisions regarding expenditures for bilingual instructional materials are made at the district, school building or classroom levels. Typically, although State Education Agencies exercised authority in adopting materials (i.e., approving materials to make them eligible for purchase), they had little influence on final purchases. In about half the school districts, purchasing decisions were shared by two different levels of authority. Table 10 summarizes responses regarding the authority for adopting and purchasing bilingual instructional material.

TABLE 10

LEVEL AT WHICH DECISIONS ARE MADE TO ADOPT AND PURCHASE BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS BY TYPE OF FUNDING*

LEVEL	Percent of Responses From Title VII Projects (N=159)		Percent of Responses From Other Projects (N=103)	
	Adopt	Purchase	Adopt	Purchase
State	25.2%	5.0%	29.1%	6.8%
LEA	62.9%	72.3%	53.4%	62.1%
School/Classroom	57.9%	67.9%	61.2%	74.8%
Other (e.g., Community Regional, Consortia)	5.7%	3.1%	1.0%	1.9%

*Due to multiple responses, percentages total more than 100%.

The questionnaire asked respondents to list the single basic text, curriculum guide, filmstrip, etc., that is most used in the classroom for each language, subject, and grade level, including materials developed locally. As would be expected from the preponderance of Spanish programs, most items mentioned were in Spanish. (See Table 11 on the following page.) As shown in Table 12, over half the types of materials listed as being used in Spanish and Other European (French/Greek/

Italian/Protuguese) programs were textbooks. The lower percentage of textbooks mentioned in Asian, Native American and Other programs probably reflects the limited availability of texts for those languages.

TABLE 11

PERCENT OF RESPONSES SPECIFYING MATERIALS BEING USED IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Language of Programs	Percent of Responses From Title VII Projects	Percent of Responses From Other projects
Spanish	73.6	89.3
Other European*	10.0	9.0
Asian	3.1	.3
Native American	7.0	.7
Other**	6.3	.7
	100.0	100.0
Total Number of Materials Mentioned	702	413
Number of School Districts Responding	155	95

*French/Greek/Italian/Protuguese

**"Other" languages listed in Table 6, page 20.

TABLE 12

TYPES OF MATERIALS USED IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

TYPES OF MATERIALS	PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Text	67.1	59.7	42.9	8.2	18.2	58.3	49.7	58.8	-	33.3	66.7	50.0
Teacher or Curriculum Guides	12.4	28.4	4.8	26.5	9.1	14.5	11.5	23.5	-	66.7	-	12.7
Kits	8.0	3.0	-	12.2	31.9	9.2	12.8	-	-	-	-	11.8
Audiovisual	3.4	3.0	-	8.2	4.5	3.6	4.9	-	-	-	-	4.4
Chart/Game/Poster/Workbook	2.8	1.5	-	14.3	2.3	3.3	7.9	17.7	-	-	-	8.6
All Types	1.2	-	-	4.1	4.5	1.5	4.4	-	-	-	-	3.9
Supplementary Materials	1.4	-	-	2.0	4.5	1.5	1.4	-	100.0	-	33.3	1.7
Test	.2	-	-	-	2.3	.3	.8	-	-	-	-	.7
Other***	2.4	1.5	47.6	22.5	18.2	6.1	.35	-	-	-	-	3.1
Unspecified	1.2	3.0	4.8	2.0	4.5	1.7	3.0	-	-	-	-	2.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number of Materials Mentioned	507	67	21	49	44	688	366	34	1	3	3	407

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages listed in Table 6, page 20.

***Includes periodicals, translations, and reference works.

Table 13 presents a summary of the type of bilingual education material reported as most used by subject matter and language group. As shown, Language Arts account for half or more of the materials cited in all languages except the Asian and Other language categories.* Although frequently mentioned, English as a Second Language (ESL) materials are underrepresented in the analysis because they are usually written in English and thus could not be attributed to specific languages of bilingual programs.

Title VII projects tend to list somewhat higher proportions of materials in mathematics, social sciences and natural sciences than the non-Title VII projects. As suggested by the data in Table 14, this is almost certainly a result of more classes at the secondary school level (and the use of more secondary school materials) in Title VII funded than in the other projects. Nevertheless, over three quarters of all materials mentioned were used in the elementary grades in both Title VII and non-Title VII projects, and there were almost no secondary school level materials reported by the Asian and little by the Native American Programs.

Overall, more than 1,000 different language/subject/grade level combinations were mentioned in the listings of materials, but 81 percent of them are accounted for by the 21 most frequently cited combinations. These combinations are presented in Table 15. As the table shows, the greatest demand was for language arts materials for the elementary grades.**

Most of the materials respondents cited as being used were produced either by commercial publishers or in their school district. Commercial publishers and distributors in the U.S. were by far the most important source of Spanish materials, although much of this material was actually developed abroad (i.e., in Spain, Mexico and South America). Unlike the Spanish, materials in the Other European languages were most frequently obtained directly from foreign publishers. The second most important source for the Other European language projects was their local school district, while for Asian and Native American projects the local school district was the primary source of materials. As shown in Table 16, bilingual education centers provided only a small proportion of materials cited as being used in the projects.

---

*The Asian-American Bilingual Center (Title VII Materials Development Center in Berkeley, California) is basing its core curriculum on social studies.

**Appendix A provides more specific data on requested materials by individual language.

TABLE 13

SUBJECT MATTER OF MATERIALS USED IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

SUBJECT MATTER	PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Language Arts[1]	50.1	40.1	18.2	51.0	14.0	45.8	56.4	48.7	-	66.7	66.7	55.2
Mathematics	14.9	14.3	4.5	6.1	16.3	14.0	9.4	8.1	-	-	-	9.2
Social Sciences[2]	11.9	14.3	27.3	8.2	18.6	12.8	6.4	13.5	-	-	-	6.9
ESL/English Language Arts	7.8	1.4	-	2.0	11.6	6.8	14.2	5.4	-	-	-	13.1
Natural Sciences[3]	7.6	4.3	9.1	4.1	18.6	7.8	3.6	10.8	-	-	-	4.2
Cultural Materials	1.4	-	22.7	12.2	9.3	3.2	.8	-	-	-	-	.8
All Subjects	4.1	21.4	9.1	14.3	2.3	6.6	7.8	13.5	100.0	33.3	33.3	8.9
Other[4]	2.1	4.3	9.1	2.0	9.3	3.0	1.4	-	-	-	-	1.2
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number of Materials Mentioned	511	70	22	49	43	695	360	37	1	3	3	404

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages listed in Table 6, page 20,

---

[1] Includes reading, vocabulary, conversation and grammar.

[2] Includes geography, history, civics and social studies.

[3] Includes general science, biology and chemistry.

[4] Includes health and safety, vocational education, driver education and music.

TABLE 14

GRADE LEVEL OF MATERIALS BEING USED IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

GRADE LEVEL	PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
K- 3	38.8	20.9	43.7	24.4	10.0	34.4	64.5	35.1	-	66.7	33.3	61.4
4- 6	5.8	7.5	-	2.2	7.5	5.6	3.7	10.8	-	-	33.3	4.5
K- 6	29.8	46.3	37.5	42.2	20.0	31.9	19.1	13.5	100.0	33.3	33.3	19.0
K- 8	4.3	6.0	6.3	8.9	5.0	4.9	2.5	16.2	-	-	-	3.8
K-12	1.2	4.5	-	6.7	2.5	1.9	2.0	2.7	-	-	-	2.0
7- 9	7.6	3.0	-	-	5.0	6.3	4.8	13.5	-	-	-	5.5
7-12	2.9	3.0	-	15.6	7.5	4.0	.3	8.1	-	-	-	1.0
10-12	9.7	9.0	12.5	-	42.5	11.0	3.1	-	-	-	-	2.8
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number of Materials Mentioned	487	67	16	45	155	655	355	37	1	3	76	399

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages listed in Table 6, page 20.

NOTE: Because almost all respondents reported grades in ranges rather than in discrete years, codes were developed to coincide with the ranges reported. Readers should combine categories that fall within areas of interest.

TABLE 15

NUMBER OF MATERIALS USED IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY LANGUAGE, SUBJECT AND GRADE LEVEL [1]

Language	Subject	Grade Level	Number of Materials Used
Spanish	Language Arts	K- 3	231
Spanish	Language Arts	K- 6	125
Spanish	Language Arts	4- 6	44
Spanish	Language Arts	K- 8	16
Spanish	Language Arts	7- 9	13
Spanish	Language Arts	10-12	14
Spanish	English as a Second Language (ESL)	K- 3	64
Spanish	ESL	K- 6	6
Spanish	Mathematics	K- 3	39
Spanish	Mathematics	7- 9	11
Spanish	Mathematics	10-12	10
Spanish	Social Studies	K- 6	15
Spanish	Social Studies	7- 9	16
Spanish	Social Studies	10-12	17
Spanish	Science	K- 6	14
Spanish	"All" Subjects	K- 3	28
Spanish	"All" Subjects	K- 6	13
European	Language Arts	K- 6	19
European	Language Arts	K- 3	7
European	"All" Subjects	K- 3	7
Native American	Language Arts	K- 6	8
English	English as a Second Language (ESL)	K- 3	60
English	ESL	K- 6	44
English	ESL	K- 8	13
English	ESL	7- 9	10
TOTAL			844
Percent of Total Materials Used			81.09%
Total Materials Used			1,042

---

[1] Some grade categories that fell within reported categories were too small for inclusion. Consequently, totals reported are slightly underrepresented.

TABLE 16

PUBLICATION SOURCE OF MATERIALS USED IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECTS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

PUBLICATION SOURCE	PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other** Languages	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Commercial U.S. Sources 1/	66.1	15.8	5.0	6.3	9.3	51.7	70.7	5,6	-	-	66.7	63.2
Foreign Sources	14.2	36.8	9.1	-	4.7	14.4	7.4	63.9	-	-	-	12.3
School Districts	12.4	42.1	57.1	91.6	72.0	26.0	11.0	22.2	100.0	100.0	33.3	12.8
Title VII Dissemination and Assessment Centers	4.7	-	-	-	-	3.5	7.4	-	-	-	-	6.5
Title VII Materials and Development Centers	1.2	5.3	23.8	-	-	2.1	.5	-	-	-	-	.5
Laboratories	1.2	-	-	-	-	7.9	2.0	-	-	-	-	1.8
Other 2/	.2	-	5.0	2.1	14.0	1.4	1.0	8.3	-	-	-	.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number of Materials Mentioned	492	57	21	48	43	661	351	36	1	2	3	399

* French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages listed in Table 6, page 20.

1/ Includes local and state centers, professional organizations, tribes and Bureau of Indian Affairs.

2/ Includes foreign publishers, US publishers & distributors. Much of the material is actually developed in other countries.

In response to a specific question about the development of local materials, a total of 85 percent of the Title VII funded projects and 55 percent of those supported from other sources reported having produced some materials. As shown in Table 17, the more complex and expensive types of materials such as textbooks and audiovisuals were most frequently obtained from commercial sources. Teachers guides which required less sustained work and financial commitment were more frequently produced by the school districts.

Tables 18 and 19 provide a breakdown of data on locally developed materials by subject area and grade level. As shown, language arts was the most frequently reported subject in which materials were developed except in the smallest (i.e., Other) language category where ESL materials predominated. Also, most materials developed were for the elementary grades. However, in the Asian projects slightly over half were for students in junior and senior high school grades.

B. Expressed Need for Additional Materials

As might be expected from the foregoing, there is a demand for additional bilingual education materials. However, the kinds of materials the respondents identified as needed did not always correspond to apparent shortages. Essentially, what was requested was more and better versions of the same materials they were using in the classrooms, not materials in different subjects, grade levels or formats. The same is true with respect to materials for programs in English as a Second Language (ESL).

1. ESL Materials

Over half the districts responding to the survey had separate programs in English as a Second Language (ESL) that were not components of their bilingual education programs, and over half of these, i.e., a total of 28 percent of the total sample, reported needing materials. The materials needed were among all grades and most often were for audiovisual items and kits. The need for ESL texts is less important than it is for bilingual texts, most likely because of the greater number of ESL materials available. In fact, fewer items were listed as being needed for each ESL program than for each bilingual program. However, about three-fifths of the needed items were reported as being unavailable, and two-fifths were considered available but unsuitable to the projects' requirements.

TABLE . 17

TYPES OF MATERIALS USED IN BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY PUBLISHER AND TYPE OF FUNDING

PUBLICATION SOURCE	PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS					PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS				
	Text	Teacher or Curriculum Guide	Chart/ Game/Poster/ Workbook	Kit	Audio-visual	Text	Teacher or Curriculum Guide	Chart/ Game/Poster Workbook	Kit	Audio-visual
Commercial US Sources*	69.4	21.4	53.6	60.3	72.0	76.4	31.3	65.2	65.4	86.9
Foreign Sources	18.5	3.4	14.3	1.4	-	16.3	1.5	16.3	-	4.3
School District	7.5	60.7	28.5	24.7	20.0	.9	52.0	11.6	18.2	8.7
Dissemination and Assessment Center	2.3	7.7	-	5.5	-	3.1	13.4	-	10.9	-
Materials Development Center	1.6	4.3	-	-	-	.4	-	-	-	-
Laboratory	-	1.7	3.6	5.5	4.0	1.8	1.5	2.3	5.5	-
Other**	.7	.8	-	-	4.0	.9	-	4.6	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Mentioned	438	117	28	73	25	221	67	43	55	23

---

* Includes foreign publishers, US publishers and US distributors.

** Includes Local and State Centers, Professional Organizations, Tribes and Bureau of Indian Affairs.

TABLE 18

SUBJECTS OF MATERIALS DEVELOPED IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

SUBJECTS	PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other** Languages	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Language Arts[1] Other than English	35.2	32.6	28.0	41.2	12.9	30.4	40.2	25.0	-	100.0	-	33.9
Social Sciences[2]	12.7	13.1	12.0	8.8	8.2	11.1	10.9	-	50.0	-	13.3	11.3
Mathematics	10.4	13.1	12.0	-	8.2	9.6	8.7	25.0	-	-	-	7.8
Cultural Materials	9.5	4.3	4.0	11.8	5.9	8.0	1.1	-	-	-	6.7	1.7
ESL/English Language Arts	5.0	-	-	-	44.7	12.0	14.1	50.0	-	-	60.0	20.9
Natural Sciences[3]	5.0	8.6	12.0	2.9	7.2	5.8	2.2	-	50.0	-	6.7	3.5
All Subjects	5.0	13.1	28.0	5.9	8.2	8.2	13.0	-	-	-	13.3	12.2
Other[4]	17.2	15.2	4.0	29.4	4.7	14.9	9.8	-	-	-	-	9.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number of Materials Mentioned	221	46	25	34	85	415	92	4	2	1	15	115

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese **"Other" languages listed in Table 6, p.20.

[1] Includes reading, vocabulary, conversation and grammar.

[2] Includes geography, history, civics, and social studies.

[3] Includes general science, geology, and chemistry.

[4] Includes remedial education, vocational education, health and safety, and driver education.

TABLE 19

GRADE LEVELS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS DEVELOPED IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

GRADE LEVELS	PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Titke VII Projects	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Pre K-3	28.8	33.9	40.8	31.3	26.2	29.9	56.7	50.0	-	66.7	11.8	49.6
4- 6	4.1	7.1	-	-	2.4	3.4	1.1	-	-	-	5.9	1.7
K- 6	34.3	42.9	7.4	31.3	25.0	31.0	21.1	50.0	66.7	-	52.9	26.9
K- 8	6.4	-	-	25.0	11.9	7.9	2.2	-	-	-	5.9	1.7
K-12	6.8	-	-	12.4	8.3	6.5	6.7	-	33.3	33.3	17.6	9.6
7- 9	5.9	4.8	18.5	-	9.5	6.9	7.8	-	-	-	-	6.1
7-12	3.2	2.4	33.3	-	3.6	2.7	1.1	-	-	-	-	.9
10-12	10.5	9.5	-	-	13.1	11.7	3.3	-	-	-	5.9	3.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number of Materials Mentioned	219	42	27	32	84	403	90	4	3	3	17	115

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

Note: Because almost all respondents reported grades in ranges rather than in discrete years, codes were developed to coincide with the ranges reported. Readers may combine categories that fall within areas of interest.

2. Bilingual Education Materials

As shown in Table 20 below, needs for materials are extensive. Projects listing materials needed for bilingual education classes ranged from a low of 37 percent of Asian Title VII projects to a high of 100 percent of Native American non-Title VII projects. The exceptionally low incidence of Asian projects reporting needs is incongruent with the shortage of Asian materials and the high proportion of respondents who reported needing all types of materials in all subjects and grades.*

TABLE 20

PERCENT OF PROJECTS REPORTING NEED FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

LANGUAGE	TITLE VII PROJECTS		OTHER PROJECTS	
	Percent	Number of Districts	Percent	Number of Districts
Spanish	76.6	124	68.8	93
Other European*	73.2	41	90.0	10
Asian	37.0	27	40.0	5
Native American	79.2	24	100.0	3
Other**	94.7	19	60.0	5

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20

The data reported in Table 20 above and that presented in Tables 21 through 22 come from the responses to the question, "Which kinds of bilingual education curriculum materials does your district program need that are not available now?" Respondents were instructed to specify: (a) the type of material, e.g., text, curriculum guide, filmstrip, etc.; (b) language; (c) subject; (d) grade level; (e) estimated number of students needing the material each year; and (f) relative availability of the material they listed.

---

*See Material Inventory Section of this report and Tables 20-22.

TABLE 21

TYPES OF MATERIALS NEEDED FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

TYPES OF MATERIALS	PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Textbook	52.2	33.3	28.6	20.6	23.3	42.4	34.1	18.8	66.7	25.0	-	32.1
Teacher Guide or Curriculum Guide	16.8	17.5	9.5	17.9	23.3	17.1	20.2	18.8	-	25.0	25.0	19.9
"All Types"	6.8	12.2	38.1	17.9	28.8	12.2	6.9	-	-	25.0	-	7.1
Audiovisual	6.3	8.8	4.8	15.4	-	7.1	12.4	37.5	-	25.0	-	14.7
Supplementary Text	4.5	14.0	-	7.7	3.3	6.0	3.4	6.2	-	-	-	3.2
Test	3.1	8.8	-	-	-	3.3	6.9	12.5	-	-	-	7.1
Kit	2.3	1.8	-	-	3.3	1.9	6.9	-	-	-	0	5.8
Chart/Game/Poster/Workbook	1.4	1.8	-	5.1	3.3	1.9	1.5	6.2	-	-	-	1.9
Unspecified	6.3	1.8	19.0	15.4	16.7	8.1	7.7	-	33.3	-	50.0	8.2
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number of Materials Mentioned	221	57	21	39	30	368	129	16	3	4	4	156

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20

TABLE 22

SUBJECTS OF MATERIALS NEEDED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

SUBJECT	PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Language Arts (Other than English)	27.1	24.5	33.3	8.6	16.7	24.4	33.9	6.3	-	25.0	25.0	30.1
Social Science[2]	23.1	13.2	14.3	11.4	6.7	18.6	16.5	12.5	50.0	-	-	15.7
Natural Sciences[3]	13.5	1.9	9.5	-	-	9.2	8.7	6.3	-	-	-	7.8
"All Subjects"	10.0	43.4	42.9	57.1	50.0	24.7	15.7	37.4	-	50.0	50.0	19.6
Cultural Materials	8.1	3.8	-	2.9	3.3	6.1	2.4	12.5	-	25.0	-	3.9
Mathematics	7.7	7.5	-	11.4	3.3	7.2	10.2	-	-	-	25.0	9.1
ESL/English Language Arts	3.2	-	-	-	13.3	3.1	3.1	6.3	-	-	-	3.3
Other[4]	7.3	5.7	-	8.6	6.7	6.7	9.5	18.7	50.0	-	-	10.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number of Materials Mentioned	221	53	21	35	30	360	127	16	2	4	4	153

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

[1] Includes reading, vocabulary, conversation, and grammar

[2] Includes geography, history, civics, and social studies.

[3] Includes general science, biology, and chemistry.

[4] Includes health and safety, vocational education, driver education, and fine arts.

Table 21 describes the needed materials by type of material and language and Table 22 by subject matter and language. As shown, the major type of items needed for most languages are textbooks, followed by teacher and curriculum guides. Language arts and social studies are the subject areas in which there is the greatest reported need. Nearly a half of the responses in the non-Spanish language categories, however, were for materials in "All Subjects" and many were for materials of "All Types."

Overall, the Title VII and non-Title VII respondents reported a total of 176,091 students needing 514 different languages, subject and grade combinations. Almost three-fifths of these materials and almost three-fourths of the students are accounted for by the 35 response categories listed in Table 23. As suggested by this Table, the greatest demand across all language groups is for elementary level materials. The large demand for Spanish language materials is somewhat surprising given the relative abundance of materials in Spanish.

In the Title VII funded districts with Spanish projects, half the respondents reported that the materials they indicated as needed were available but unsuitable. Of the respondents from Spanish projects not receiving Title VII funds, about three-fifths indicated that the materials they needed were not available. This difference may be an indication that the Title VII respondents had more information about availability of materials than the others.

As shown in Table 24, virtually all the respondents from Asian Native American and Other language projects indicated that the materials they needed were not available. The unsuitability of existing materials in Spanish and in the Other European languages may be due in part to the availability of materials developed by foreign publishers and to the perception that materials developed in one locality or for one ethnic group may not be appropriate for another. This conjecture is supported somewhat by the data on the reasons available materials are considered unsuitable summarized in Table 25. The principle reasons given for the unsuitability of available materials were: (1) inconsistency with school curriculum, (2) difficulty of language, and (3) cultural irrelevancy. Interestingly, these are the same criticisms of bilingual education materials that were reported some four years ago in the Materials Acquisition Project.*

---

*Apuntes Sobre La Revision Creacion de Materiales de Ensenanza en Espanol para Los. Ee. Uu. 1974

TABLE 23

NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND PROJECTS NEEDING BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS BY LANGUAGE, SUBJECT AND GRADE*

Language	Subject	Grade	Number of Students Represented	Number of Projects Needing Material
Spanish	Language Arts	K- 3	4,582	28
Spanish	Language Arts	4- 6	1,314	7
Spanish	Language Arts	K- 6	12,062	28
Spanish	Language Arts	K- 8	3,160	11
Spanish	Language Arts	K-12	8,454	14
Spanish	Language Arts	10-12	780	5
Spanish	Social Sciences	K- 3	2,965	12
Spanish	Social Sciences	K- 6	6,070	14
Spanish	Social Sciences	K- 8	3,515	8
Spanish	Social Sciences	K-12	15,423	6
Spanish	Social Sciences	7-12	2,034	6
Spanish	Social Sciences	10-12	1,105	15
Spanish	Cultural Materials	K- 3	500	5
Spanish	Cultural Materials	K- 6	1,690	8
Spanish	Cultural Materials	K-12	500	5
Spanish	All Subjects	K- 3	1,673	6
Spanish	All Subjects	K-12	9,857	14
Spanish	Mathematics	K- 8	1,155	4
Spanish	Mathematics	10-12	758	5
Spanish	English Language Arts/ESL	K- 3	607	8
Spanish	Science	K- 6	1,350	12
Spanish	Science	10-12	538	6
Spanish	Science	K-12	15,968	10
Other European**	All Subjects	K- 3	1,060	5
Other European	All Subjects	K- 6	1,774	9
Other European	All Subjects	K-12	1,471	12
Other European	Language Arts	K-12	740	4
Other European	Language Arts	K- 6	830	5

---

*Some grade categories that fell within reported categories were too small for inclusion, consequently, totals reported are slightly underrepresented.

**French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

TABLE 23 (Cont'd.)

Language	Subject	Grade	Number of Students Represented	Number of Projects Needing Material
Asian	All Subjects	10-12	830	3
Native American	All Subjects	K- 6	954	6
Native American	All Subjects	K-12	633	7
Native American	Mathematics	K- 3	635	3
Other***	All Subjects	K- 8	1,300	3
Other***	All Subjects	K-12	9,581	5
Other***	Language Arts	K- 8	8,055	4
Percent of Total			74.2	57.8
Total Number Mentioned			176,091	514

***"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

TABLE 24

PERCEIVED AVAILABILITY OF NEEDED BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						PERCENT OF RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other** Languages	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Language	Other European Languages*	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other** Languages	All Non-Title VII Projects
Available but unsuitable	50.2	42.2	6.7	7.9	4.0	38.9	37.4	29.4	-	-	-	34.
Not Available	49.8	57.8	93.3	92.1	96.0	61.1	62.6	70.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	65.8
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Items Mentioned	211	45	15	38	25	334	123	17	3	4	2	14

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

TABLE 25

REASONS AVAILABLE MATERIALS ARE CONSIDERED UNSUITABLE FOR USE IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY LANGUAGE

REASONS CITED	Spanish	Other European*	Asian	Native American	Total
Not Consistent with Curriculum	24.1	25.0	50.0	14.3	24.2
Language Too Difficult	23.9	25.0	-	14.3	23.8
Not Culturally Relevant	19.0	18.3	-	14.3	18.8
Too Expensive	14.2	10.0	-	28.5	13.8
Physically Unattractive	8.0	8.4	-	14.3	8.0
Sexual Bias	4.0	10.0	-	14.3	5.0
Inaccurate	4.8	3.3	-	-	4.5
Other	2.0	-	50.0	-	1.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Reasons Mentioned	352	60	2	7	421

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

Summary

In investigating the needs for materials of the bilingual education projects, information about materials already in classroom use was gathered first. The projects surveyed spent an average of between $8.93 and $16.44 per child in each language category for bilingual instructional materials during the 1976-1977 school year. Most of the decisions about which materials would be purchased were made at the district or school level, although in some cases the selection was from materials adopted by the State Education Agency.

The single item reported as most used in bilingual classrooms is a language arts text for elementary grades. Texts were the major type of material mentioned in the Spanish and Other European language categories, with fewer of them used in Asian, Native American and Other languages -- probably reflecting the lesser availability of texts in those languages. Language arts is the major subject area of the materials used in most projects, although in Asian projects social science and cultural materials predominate and in the Other language category there is no predominant subject area. In all language and funding categories, most of the materials mentioned were for elementary grade levels.

Most of the items in classroom use for Spanish and Other European languages were produced by commercial sources, with foreign publishers accounting for most of those in the European category. The main source for the other non-Spanish languages were the school districts themselves. Except for Asian Title VII projects, little of the materials mentioned as being used were produced in the Title VII Network.

Most of the projects reported needing additional materials. Over half the districts responding to the survey had ESL programs that were separate from their bilingual education programs, and over half of these mentioned needing some ESL materials. The materials needed by the bilingual projects were much the same as those already in use. Again, language arts texts for elementary grades predominated. However, in the non-Spanish languages, materials most often were wanted in "All subjects" and, frequently, in all types of formats for all grades.

Consistent with the wide need for materials, virtually all of the Asian, Native American and Other language projects reported that the items they needed were not available. This was also reported by the majority of European projects, half the Title VII Spanish projects and over three-fifths of the Spanish projects not supported by Title VII funds. Of those which said that the available materials were not suitable, the major reasons given were that they were not consistent with the curricula, they were too difficult and they were not culturally relevant.

CHAPTER IV: IMPROVING THE CURRENT DISSEMINATION SYSTEM

The previous chapter addressed the first major purpose of the school survey, to investigate the needs of school personnel for bilingual education materials. This chapter addresses the second major purpose, to provide information from the perspective of the local education agencies on how to improve the system of disseminating bilingual education materials and supportive services, particularly those provided through the Title VII Centers. More specifically, this chapter gives a brief overview of the materials development and dissemination system, an assessment of the use and usefulness of the Title VII Centers as reported by survey respondents, and their suggestions for improving the current system.

In presenting the study findings in this area it should be noted at the outset that data were collected on a school district basis. Because many of the district projects have more than one language component (an average of 1.36 in Title VII districts and 1.05 in the others), this means that when information is reported by language some responses are counted twice and thus the language group data may be somewhat inflated. For this reason the data are also being reported separately by district.

A. Overview of Current System

A full description and discussion of the material development and dissemination system is presented in a companion volume to this report and will not be repeated here.* Only background information needed for understanding the survey results is provided below.

Bilingual education projects obtain information, materials and other services from a variety of sources. Overall, most information and materials come to local school districts from commercial publishers and distributors.** Particularly, this is the case with materials in Spanish and Other European languages. Besides commercial sources, information on existing materials comes most frequently from the Title VII Centers, and State Departments of Education. For development of materials, bilingual educators rely on these sources but also rely heavily on materials they and their co-workers develop themselves. Notably, much of the materials used in Native American and some Asian language programs are locally developed because virtually no commercially published material is available.

---

*Development Associates, "A Study of the State of Bilingual Materials Development and the Transition of Materials to the Classroom" 1978 (A companion volume to this report).

**Includes foreign and U.S. publishers and distributors; most of the materials available from the U.S. distributors is actually developed overseas.

Of particular importance from the federal standpoint, is the Network of Title VII supported Bilingual Education Centers. In accordance with Federal rules and regulations there are three basic types of Title VII Centers. These are:

- Materials Development Centers (MDC's) which create bilingual instructional materials and tests.
- Dissemination and Assessment Centers (DAC's) which assess needs for materials, evaluate what is available, and publish, publicize and sell the materials the MDC's have produced.
- Training Resource Centers (TRC's) which give courses and workshops in bilingual teaching methods, selection and use of materials and related subjects, and also arrange for the field testing of MDC's bilingual education materials by classroom teachers.

Other bilingual education centers are supported by different federal, state and local sources. Included among these centers are those supported by HEW's Office of Civil Rights (Lau Centers), laboratories funded by the National Institute of Education and centers supported by state and local funds.

According to federal regulations, the Title VII Centers primarily are expected to serve the LEA projects funded through the Bilingual Education Act. As will be apparent from the survey responses reported below, in practice the distinctions regarding services performed are not completely clear. Furthermore, while it was expected that some of the non-Title VII projects would have had some contact with Title VII Centers, the number of such districts and the extent of the contact was considerably greater than anticipated.

B. Use and Usefulness of Title VII Centers

According to the survey respondents, contact between school personnel and bilingual education centers is high. Because it was unlikely that all respondents would know which centers were and were not supported by Title VII grants, the questionnaire asked that the specific centers which had given services be named. These were then coded as: one of the three types of Title VII Centers, Office of Civil Rights ("Lau") Centers, state and local centers, and NIE laboratories. Of the total number responding, 97.1% of the Title VII districts and 81.3% of the districts funded from other sources reported some type of contact with at least one of the bilingual education centers during the past year.

Four specific types of contact involving receipt of services from the centers were investigated. These dealt with information, materials, teacher training and conferences. As shown in Table 26 below, over half of the Title VII projects received each of the four types of services, ranging from 90.7% receiving information to 50.4% receiving educational materials. While the overall amount of contact and the proportion receiving each specific type of service was considerably lower for the projects not supported by Title VII, their involvement with centers was substantially greater than expected.

TABLE 26
Percent of Responding LEA's Receiving Different Types of Services from Bilingual Education Centers During 1976-77 by Type of Funding

Type of Service	Percent of Responses from Title VII Projects	Percent of Responses from Other Projects
Receiving any service from bilingual education centers in past 12 months	97.1	81.3
Receiving Information	90.7	79.4
Receiving Materials	56.4	54.2
Receiving Teacher Trng.	70.9	49.5
Attending Conferences	75.6	49.5
Number of School Districts Responding	172	107

When responses about types of services received were analyzed by language categories, it was found that at least two thirds of the projects in all categories received some services from bilingual education centers. As shown in Table 27, all Title VII funded projects in the Asian and Other European categories had received services. Proportionately fewer respondents from the Native American language projects reported receiving any assistance from the centers than any of the other groups.

TABLE 27
Percent of Respondents Receiving Different
Types of Services from Bilingual Education Centers
During 1976-77 by Language and Type of Funding

Languages	Percent of Responses from Title VII Projects	Percent of Responses from Other Projects
Spanish	97.6	80.2
Other European*	100.0	100.0
Asian	100.0	80.0
Native American	87.0	66.8
Other**	94.7	100.0
Number of Projects Responding	234	113

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

Information Source

To obtain more detailed insight into the relative importance of various sources of information, we asked respondents to indicate on a three point scale the amount of information about bilingual education materials they had received from thirteen listed sources. Answers were weighted two points for "Much information," one point for "Some information," and zero points for "No information." As indicated in Table 28, commercial publishers' catalogs and circulars were the greatest source of information for most projects. The next greatest sources were Title VII Centers' printed matter, conferences and workshops. Although, as reported in the previous chapter, much of the material used in many projects was developed locally, the respondents indicated that relatively little information on materials came directly from other school districts.

Consistent with these ratings were the results of an open-ended item requesting the respondents to identify their "single most important source of information." As indicated in Table 29 on page 54, commercial sources were most frequently cited as the most important source of information by respondents from all language categories except Asian and Title VII Native American. Indeed, commercial publishers and distributors together with bilingual education centers account for most of the responses received from all except the Title VII Native American category.

TABLE 28
MEAN RATINGS OF AMOUNTS OF INFORMATION RECEIVED ABOUT BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS FROM VARIOUS SOURCES BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING [1/]

SOURCE OF INFORMATION	MEAN RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						MEAN RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Commercial Publishers' and Distributors Catalogs or Circulars	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.1	1.4	.7	1.4	1.4
Bilingual Education Centers' Bibliographies or Bulletins.	1.3	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.0	1.0	.8	.3	1.0	.9
Bilingual Education Centers' Conferences, Workshops, Meetings.	1.2	1.2	1.2	.9	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2	.0	1.6	1.1
Commercial Publishers' Sample Copies or Sales Representatives.	1.2	1.1	1.1	.4	1.1	1.0	1.0	.7	1.0	.3	1.2	.9
State Dept. of Education.	.9	.9	.9	.8	1.0	.9	.8	1.1	.8	1.0	.6	.9
Conferences not Sponsored by Bilingual Education Centers.	.9	.9	.7	.9	1.0	.9	.8	.1	.8	.3	.6	.8
Office of Bilingual Education (OBE)	.8	.8	.7	.6	1.0	.8	.5	.6	.2	.3	.4	.5
Processional Journals.	.8	.9	.7	.5	.8	.8	.6	.8	.6	.0	2.0	.7
U.S. Office of Education.	.7	.6	.6	.6	.8	.7	.4	.5	.0	.7	.0	.4
Colleces and Universities.	.7	.8	.6	.5	.6	.6	.7	.5	.8	.7	.8	.7
Other School Districts.	.7	.7	.6	.3	.4	.6	.5	.6	.4	.7	.4	.6
ERIC.	.5	1.0	.6	.3	.2	.4	.3	.1	.2	.0	.4	.3
National Institute of Education (NIE)	.3	.2	.4	.2	.4	.3	.2	.2	.2	.0	.2	.1

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

[1/] Ratings are on a three-point scale: Much (2), Some (1), and No (0).

TABLE 29

SOURCES OF INFORMATION CITED AS MOST IMPORTANT BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

SOURCE OF INFORMATION	MEAN RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						MEAN RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
	(N=105)	(N=33)	(N=25)	(N=17)	(N=15)	(N=145)	(N=84)	(N=10)	(N=5)	(N=3)	(N=5)	(N=100)
Commercial Publishers.	47.6	48.4	32.0	11.8	33.3	40.0	34.5	30.0	20.0	66.7	60.0	33.0
Bilingual Education Centers	30.5	36.5	60.0	29.4	20.0	31.1	25.1	20.0	40.0	--	20.0	27.0
State Departments of Education	2.9	3.0	4.0	5.8	13.3	4.8	15.5	30.0	--	--	--	16.0
Other***	19.0	12.2	4.0	53.0	33.4	24.1	24.9	20.0	40.0	33.3	30.0	24.0

*French/Greek.Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20

***Includes: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Colleges and Universities, Professional Schools, National Institute of Education, Conferences not sponsored by Title VII Centers, U.S. Office of Education, and other school districts.

In citing the bilingual education centers from which they received information about materials and services, project directors reported that most came from the Title VII Training Resource Centers and the Title VII Dissemination and Assessment Centers. These types of Centers accounted for 48.2% and 24.7% respectively of the centers cited as providing information. A summary of responses by type of center is shown as Table 30 on the following page.

Source Materials

To assess the relative importance of sources of instructional materials, we asked respondents to indicate on a three point scale the amount of material they had received during the preceding twelve months (i.e., Fall 1976 - 1977). Answers were weighted three points for "Much material," two points for "Some material," and one point for "No material."

As shown in Table 31, commercial publishers received the highest ratings except from Asian and Native American project personnel. In these projects, more materials came from the project school or classroom teachers. Overall, local schools and teachers and then local school districts were rated second and third highest respectively, with the bilingual education centers rated fourth.

As shown in Table 32 on page 57, this is consistent with the responses to an open-ended item requesting the "single most important source of materials." In analyzing this item the distinction made above between the individual school and central district offices was not possible because the written responses did not consistently differentiate between them. Thus, the reliance of many projects on locally developed materials is even more clear in this Table. Except for the Spanish language projects, the respondents' own school districts were identified most frequently as the most important sources of materials, with commercial publishers rated a strong second and the bilingual education centers a distant third. Indeed, the bilingual education centers were identified as the most important sources of materials by only about 13% of the respondents, and in most cases were rated as supplying less than "some" material to the various bilingual education projects.

TABLE 30

TYPE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION CENTERS WHICH PROVIDED INFORMATION ABOUT MATERIALS AND SERVICES BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

SOURCE OF INFORMATION	MEAN RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						MEAN RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
	(N=202)	(N=71)	(N=40)	(N=27)	(N=29)	(N=369)	(N=82)	(N=8)	(N=4)	(N=1)	(N=8)	(N=103)
Title VII Training Resource Centers.	44.1	53.6	52.5	66.7	41.4	48.2	34.1	50.0	--	--	50.0	34.8
Title VII Dissemination and Assessment Centers.	27.6	21.1	22.5	11.1	27.6	24.7	22.0	12.5	25.0	100	--	20.4
Title VII Materials Development Centers.	11.4	21.1	15.0	7.4	17.3	13.8	7.3	--	25.0	--	12.5	7.8
Other (Non-Title VII) Centers.***	16.9	4.2	10.0	14.8	13.7	13.3	36.6	37.5	50.0	--	37.5	37.0

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

***Other centers include those funded by the Office of Civil Rights ("Lau") and State and local sources.

TABLE 31

MEAN RATINGS OF AMOUNT OF MATERIALS RECEIVED FROM VARIOUS SOURCES BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING 1/

SOURCE OF INFORMATION	MEAN RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						MEAN RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Commercial Publishers or Distributors.	2.5	2.2	2.2	1.5	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.4	1.0	2.0	2.3
Own Schools or Classroom Teachers.	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.9	2.6	2.0	2.0	2.0
Own Central School Districts	2.0	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.8	1.8	2.3	1.8	1.8
Bilingual Education Centers	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.7	2.2	1.7
State Depts. of Education	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.0	1.7	1.2	1.4
Other School Districts	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.7	1.6	1.4

TABLE 32

MOST IMPORTANT SOURCE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

SOURCE OF INFORMATION	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Commercial Publishers.	51.3	38.5	19.2	5.3	26.3	39.9	42.0	40.0	--	33.3	20.0	41.1
Own School District.	30.8	43.6	50.0	36.7	68.4	36.2	27.3	30.0	80.0	66.7	40.0	26.1
Bilingual Education Centers	11.1	15.4	30.8	31.6	5.3	13.5	13.6	10.0	20.0	--	40.0	12.6
State Dept. of Education.	1.7	--	--	5.3	--	1.8	8.0	--	--	--	--	6.3
Other School Districts.	1.7	2.5	--	5.3	--	3.1	2.3	20.0	--	--	--	3.6
Other***	3.4	--	--	15.8	--	5.5	6.8	--	--	--	--	9.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
No. of School Districts Responding	117	39	26	19	19	163	88	10	5	3	5	111

1/ Ratings are on a three-point scale: Much (2), Some (1), and No (0). *French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese.

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

***Includes local and state centers, professional organizations, tribes, and Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The importance of locally developed materials, particularly in languages other than Spanish, is consistent with the information provided in response to questions about the materials being used in classrooms that were discussed earlier in this report (see Table 16). With respect to the role of the Title VII Centers, it is significant that little of the locally developed materials is used by school districts other than the ones developing them. While it may be that these materials are too specialized to be used outside the developing district, it is also likely that relatively few districts disseminate their materials. As shown in Table 33 below, of those districts that do routinely forward copies of local materials so that they can be shared with others, the state bilingual education offices and other school districts are sent materials somewhat more often than bilingual education centers.

TABLE 33

Projects that Routinely Forward
Locally Developed Materials
to Other Agencies, by Type of Funding

Percent of Materials Forward To:	Percent of Responses from Title VII Projects (N=147)	Percent of Responses From Non-Title VII Projects (N=59)
State Office for Bilingual Education	38.1	25.4
Other School Districts	30.6	23.7
Bilingual Education Centers	23.1	11.9

Although relatively few respondents (56%) reported receiving materials from the bilingual education centers, analyses were made to determine which type of centers were the primary sources of materials and what types of materials were supplied. As shown in Table 34 on the following page, overall the Title VII Training Resource Centers (TRC's) were the main source of materials, but with the Title VII Dissemination and Assessment Centers being the most frequently cited source for some categories of respondents. The TRC's roles as distributors of pilot testing material in the Title VII Network, and often, of bibliographies, explain their dominant position. That proportionately more non-Spanish language projects than Spanish projects received materials directly from the Materials Development Centers probably reflects the closer working relationships among smaller language groups, but it may simply be an artifact of the smaller number of responses.

TABLE 34

TYPE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION CENTERS PROVIDING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

SOURCE OF INFORMATION	MEAN RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						MEAN RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Title VII Training Resource Centers	40.4	35.0	64.0	33.3	33.3	41.8	22.2	60.0	--	--	16.7	22.5
Title VII Dissemination and Assessment Centers	35.1	30.0	12.0	33.3	33.3	30.5	31.5	--	40.0	100	16.7	29.6
Title VII Materials Development Centers	12.8	35.0	20.0	22.3	22.3	19.8	7.4	--	20.0	--	16.7	8.5
State and Local Centers	5.3	--	--	--	11.1	3.4	20.4	20.0	--	--	16.5	18.3
Other***	6.4	--	4.0	11.1	--	4.5	18.5	20.0	40.0	--	33.3	21.1

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese.

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

***Other Centers include those funded by the Office of Civil Rights ("Lau Centers"), and Laboratories.

To identify the types of materials provided, the respondents were asked whether in the past 12 months they had received from the bilingual education centers any textbooks, workbooks, audio-visual aids and teachers guides and to specify any other types of materials received. As shown in Table 35, teacher guides and curriculum guides were the main types of materials received from the centers. However, the checklist did not include a category for bibliographies and there is a possibility that many respondents included them in the teacher guide category. The next most frequently mentioned types of materials were textbooks and workbooks.

TABLE 35

TYPES OF MATERIALS RECEIVED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS FROM BILINGUAL EDUCATION CENTERS BY TYPE OF FUNDING

Types of Materials	Percent of Responses From Title VII Projects	Percent of Responses Other Projects
Teacher & Curriculum Guides	34.9	32.6
Textbooks	22.9	18.1
Workbooks	22.9	18.1
Audio-Visual	14.5	21.5
Other	4.8	9.7
TOTAL	100.0	100.0
Total Number of Materials Mentioned	258	100
Number of School Districts Responding	92	47

In addition to reporting the source and type of material provided, respondents rated materials received from the various types of bilingual education centers on both their appropriateness for the grade and skill levels of students and on their cultural relevance. The ratings were scored on a three-point scale ranging from "Mostly" appropriate or relevant (two points), to "Somewhat" (one point) to "Not at all" appropriate or relevant (zero). Mean scores were obtained for each type of center and were analyzed by project language type and by school district. The ratings for Title VII projects by language and for Title VII and other respondents overall are presented in Tables 36 and 37. Because of the small number of non-Title VII respondents in each cell, they have been excluded from the individual language breakouts. As shown in the tables, there are no clear patterns to the ratings. Materials from most centers averaged closer to "Mostly" than "Somewhat" appropriate or relevant.

TABLE 36
MEAN RATINGS OF THE APPROPRIATENESS OF CENTER-PROVIDED MATERIALS FOR STUDENTS' GRADE AND SKILL LEVELS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING 1/

SOURCE OF INFORMATION	MEAN RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						MEAN RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects***
Title VII Training Resource Centers	1.5	1.3	1.3	2.0	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.7	--	--	2.0	1.6
Title VII Dissemination and Assessment Centers	1.6	1.7	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.6	1.4	--	1.5	1.0	2.0	1.5
Title VII Materials Development Centers	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.8	--	2.0	--	2.0	1.8
State and Local Centers	1.2	--	--	--	0.0	1.0	1.5	--	--	--	2.0	1.6
Lau Centers	1.8	--	1.0	--	--	1.8	1.2	--	1.0	--	1.0	1.2
Laboratories	2.0	--	--	--	--	2.0	2.0	--	2.0	--	2.0	1.7
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.0	2.0	--	--	2.0	1.2
Mean Rating of Centers	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.7	1.0	1.5	1.7	1.8	1.6	1.0	2.0	1.5
Total Number of Centers Mentioned	82	31	23	7	7	105	49	5	5	1	6	61

1/ Ratings are on a three point scale: Mostly (2), Somewhat (1), and Not at All (0).

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese.

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

***Mean Overall includes state and local, Lau centers and others as well as the three types of Title VII Centers.

TABLE 37

MEAN RATINGS OF THE CULTURAL RELEVANCE OF MATERIALS RECEIVED FROM BILINGUAL EDUCATION CENTERS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING [1/]

SOURCE OF INFORMATION	MEAN RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						MEAN RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Title VII Training Resource Centers	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.6	1.8	1.7	--	--	1.0	1.6
Title VII Dissemination and Assessment Center	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.6	--	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.5
Title VII Materials Development Centers	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.8	--	2.0	--	2.0	1.7
State and Local Centers	1.3	--	--	--	2.0	1.4	1.6	2.0	--	--	2.0	1.6
Lau Centers	1.8	--	2.0	--	--	1.8	1.8	--	2.0	--	2.0	1.7
Laboratories	2.0	--	--	--	--	2.0	2.0	--	2.0	--	2.0	2.0
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.0	1.0	--	--	--	1.0
Mean Ratings of Centers	1.6	1.6	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.6	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.8	1.0
Total Number of Centers Mentioned	87	31	22	7	6	103	49	5	5	1	6	61

[1/] Ratings are on a three point scale: Mostly (2), Somewhat (1), Not at all (0).

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese.

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

Training and Conference Source

In addition to providing information and materials, bilingual education centers offer training to school district staffs. Overall, 71% of the Title VII and 50% of the other respondents indicated that bilingual educators in their districts had attended at least one teacher training workshop sponsored by a center in the preceding 12 months. As would be expected, most of the training for Title VII projects was provided by Title VII Training Resource Centers. Indeed, three quarters of the centers mentioned by Title VII project directors as giving training workshops were TRC's. Over a third of the centers mentioned by non-Title VII respondents were TRC's, while a quarter were state and local centers and 15% were Lau Centers supported by the Office of Civil Rights.

Of particular interest in this survey was the utility of center training in three areas: (a) the availability of instructional materials; (b) effective use of materials in the classroom, and (c) development of curriculum materials. Respondents were asked to rate the amount of useful information provided by the workshops in each of the three areas. Answers were scored on two points for "Much" information, one point for "Some" information and zero points for "None." The centers were more active in training teachers on the availability of materials and how to use them than they were in the development of bilingual education materials. A summary of the results is presented in Table 38 below.

TABLE 38

SUMMARY OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE AMOUNT OF USEFUL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY TITLE VII TRAINING RESOURCE AND OTHER CENTERS BY TYPE OF FUNDING 1/

Mean Rating of Useful Information on:	Mean Rating of Title VII Projects		Mean Rating of Other Projects	
	Training Resource Centers 2/	Overall 3/	Training Resource Centers 2/	Overall 3/
a. Information Availability	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4
b. Effective use of Materials	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.3
c. Development of Materials	1.1	1.2	.9	1.0

1/ Ratings are on a three point scale: Much (2), Some (1), and none (0). The difference between the ratings given the TRCs and all centers is not of practical significance.

2/ Title VII Training Resource Centers accounted for over three-quarters of the training received by Title VII projects and over a third of the training by other projects

3/ Includes Lau Centers and centers funded from state, local and other sources as well as three types of Title VII funded Centers.

The centers also sponsored conferences attended by bilingual education project personnel. Overall, about three-quarters of the respondents from Title VII projects and half of those from non-Title VII projects indicated that people in their school district had attended center sponsored conferences in the past year. As with the training workshops, the most frequently reported sponsor of conferences were Title VII Training Resource Centers. These were followed by Lau Centers, centers sponsored by state and local sources and then the other two types of Centers supported by Title VII funds (i.e., Dissemination and Assessment Centers and Materials and Development Centers).

Other Center Services

To supplement the direct questions asked about the centers as sources of information, materials and training, the respondents were asked to list any other service they had received from the bilingual education centers. A summary of these responses is provided in Table 39 below. As shown, "Consultation and Technical Assistance" was the major additional service received. Other, more specific types of services included "testing" (mainly in language proficiency), "Program and Teaching Evaluations,"and "Information on Compliance" with federal and state regulations.

TABLE 39

OTHER SERVICES RECEIVED FROM BILINGUAL EDUCATION CENTERS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Services	Percent of Responses from Title VII Projects	Percent of Responses from Other Projects
Consultations/Technical Assistance (unspecified)	35.2	40.7
Testing	18.3	15.6
Program and Teaching Evaluations	15.5	6.2
Compliance Information	11.3	21.9
Proposal/Report Writing	8.4	6.2
Other	11.3	9.4
TOTAL	100%	100%
Total Number of Services Mentioned	73	33
Number of School Districts Responding	57	26

C. Suggestions for Improving the System

The information on the extent of services of the Title VII Centers and how they are rated provided insight into the existing system. To supplement this information, respondents were also asked "what additional kinds of services from bilingual education centers would be useful to bilingual educators in you district?" This question was open-ended so that the most salient demands on the centers could be tapped.

Closely related to the question regarding the centers was an item focusing on the development and distribution of curriculum materials, irrespective of center involvement. We asked: "What do you think is needed to improve the ways bilingual curriculum materials are developed and disseminated?" As with the other question, this also was open-ended, thus giving an opportunity for the respondents to provide what they judged to be the most important suggestions for improvements.

Responses to these two questions are summarized on Tables 40 and 41. As indicated on Table 40, in response to the first of these questions, the most frequently requested additional service was training for teachers in methods appropriate for use in a bilingual education program. It is unclear from the responses, however, whether more or different types of training was wanted or whether this might be a vote for the most useful of all the services they have received.

Of the next five most frequently requested additional services, four pertained to materials -- specifically, information about materials, copies of existing materials, assistance in developing and disseminating local materials, and the need for more materials produced by centers. A request for greater contact between the centers and the school districts was the third most frequently made suggestion.

With respect to improving the ways bilingual curriculum materials are developed and disseminated, suggestions were grouped under five major headings as shown in Table 41. Most comments about development and dissemination of materials involved access to materials and information about them. Of particular interest were materials developed by local projects. The most frequently made suggestion was for publishing, disseminating or otherwise sharing locally produced materials. As previously shown, a considerable amount of materials used is locally developed, especially in languages other than Spanish, and little of it is disseminated to other school districts or to the federally supported Centers.

TABLE 40

SUGGESTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICES FROM BILINGUAL EDUCATION CENTERS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Services Suggested	MEAN RESPONSES FROM TITLE VII PROJECTS						MEAN RESPONSES FROM OTHER PROJECTS					
	Spanish Language	Other* Europ. Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages **	All Title VII Projs.	Spanish Language	Other* Europ. Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages **	All Non-Tit.VII Projs.
Training in Teaching Methods	25.5	25.0	35.4	27.6	20.0	25.6	35.3	27.0	37.5	40.0	42.9	33.1
Information/Evaluation of Available Materials	12.4	19.3	12.9	6.9	5.0	11.8	8.6	--	--	--	--	8.1
More Site Visits/Contact/Local Offices	10.6	13.6	9.7	3.4	15.0	10.4	5.7	9.0	--	--	--	4.8
Copies of Existing Materials	9.3	7.7	6.5	--	20.0	7.2	3.8	--	12.5	--	28.5	4.0
Assistance in Developing Printing or Disseminating Local Materials	5.0	7.7	3.2	17.3	--	7.2	5.7	9.0	--	--	--	5.6
More Materials Developed by Centers	5.6	3.8	--	--	--	4.3	2.8	9.0	--	--	--	3.2
Program/Teaching Evaluations	4.3	3.8	--	--	--	4.3	8.6	--	25.0	--	--	7.3
Language Proficiency Tests	5.0	--	9.7	--	--	3.8	6.7	--	--	--	--	5.6
Curriculum Planning	3.7	1.9	--	6.9	20.0	4.7	3.8	9.0	12.5	20.0	14.3	5.6
Management/Administration	2.5	1.9	6.5	10.4	10.0	3.3	2.8	9.0	--	--	--	3.2
More Attention to Non-Spanish Language Groups	--	1.9	--	20.7	10.0	2.8	--	--	--	20.0	--	.8
Other	11.3	9.6	16.1	3.4	--	10.8	11.4	18.0	12.5	20.0	14.3	16.2
None Needed	5.0	3.8	--	3.4	--	3.8	4.8	9.0	--	--	--	6.5
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Number of Services Mentioned	161	52	31	24	20	211	105	11	8	5	7	124
Number of School Districts Responding	107	36	22	15	15	143	65	9	5	3	5	80

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese.

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

TABLE 41

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND DISSEMINATION OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS BY LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF TITLE VII FUNDING1/

SUGGESTIONS	Responses by Language Category					Type of LEA's	
	Spanish	Other * European	Asian	Native American	Other **	Title VII	Non Title VII
Needs Assessments	4.0%	6.1%	7.2%	-	12.5%	5.0%	.9%
Materials Development	29.1%	22.7%	26.2%	61.3%	16.7%	28.4%	37.7%
Support for Local Materials Development	9	5	2	7	-	15	3
More Culturally Relevant Materials/ More Related to Local Needs	12	1	1	3	-	9	7
Evaluations of Materials	11	1	1	-	1	4	8
More Materials in Non-Spanish Languages	-	4	-	6	1	7	4
More Secondary Materials							
Dissemination	38.3%	39.4%	45.2%	25.8%	45.8%	42.2%	38.3%
Publishing/Dissemination/Sharing of Locally Produced Materials	24	7	8	4	6	26	6
More Information About Available Materials	23	6	6	1	2	19	11
Provide Sample Copies to LEA's	12	1	2	-	2	14	3
Centralized Distribution	5	4	-	3	-	7	2
Staffing (i.e., more inservice training of teachers)	6.6%	3.0%	2.4%	-	4.2%	4.5%	7.5%
Network/Centers						17.9%	17.9%
More Communication/Contact/Conferences	14	8	1	2	3	13	5
Better Coordination/Less Duplication	10	4	1	-	1	10	3
Other	3.1% 100%	1.5% 100%	9.5% 100%	- 100%	- 100%	2.0% 100%	4.7% 100%
Total Suggestions Mentioned	227	66	42	31	24	201	106
Number of School Districts Responding	166	47	29	23	18	147	77

1/ Note that only major headings are in percents; subcategories are in raw numbers. Only suggestions made by 5% or more of the respondents in at least one language category are reported.

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

In addition to emphasizing support for development and dissemination of locally produced materials, the respondents' suggestions included the development of more materials in languages other than Spanish, materials which would be more culturally relevant, and materials for secondary school students. They also recommended development and dissemination of evaluations of existing materials and the provision of sample copies to school districts for their review. Finally, and overlapping somewhat the responses to the preceding question, many respondents urged more communication and contact among bilingual education projects and between the projects and centers, through more conferences, workshops and other means of enhancing contact and coordination.

While the preceding constitute the primary sources of information regarding respondents' views on improving the present system of materials development and dissemination, a third question provided some additional data from about 30% of the respondents. As the final item on the questionnaire respondents were invited to write additional comments, and a summary of these comments is provided as Table 42. Although the most frequently made comments related to descriptions of the respondent's own project or to objections to the large number of survey-type requests, it is of interest to note that several emphasized the need for additional materials and for better public relations and improved communications about bilingual education programs.

D. Summary

Bilingual education projects report extensive contact with bilingual education centers, particularly as sources of information and for materials, training, and conferences. Nevertheless, in activities relating to materials, bilingual education centers are considerably less important than other sources. Although a large majority of both Title VII and non-Title VII projects received information from bilingual education centers, commercial sources were a more important source of information about materials for all language groups except Asian and Native American. As a source of materials, the centers are far behind commercial publishers and distributors* except for the Asian group, and centers are less important than local development for all language groups.

Most services reported as being received from bilingual centers were from Title VII Centers. Ratings of their materials were high on both cultural relevancy and meeting the grade and skill levels of students, although they were somewhat higher on the former.

---

* Includes foreign and U.S. publishers and distributors. Most of the material available from U.S. distributors is actually developed overseas.

TABLE 42

SUMMARY OF VOLUNTARY COMMENTS OF RESPONDENTS BY LANGUAGE AND BY TITLE VII FUNDING

COMMENT	RESPONSES BY LANGUAGE CATEGORY					TYPE OF LEA'S	
	Spanish	Other* European	Asian	Native American	Other**	Title VII	Non-Title VII
Description of Respondents own Project	32.0	23.8	23.8	32.0	33.3	30.0	33.2
Objections to Surveys	14.7	28.6	19.0	8.0	--	12.3	11.9
Materials Unsuitable/Too Few	12.0	9.5	--	12.0	--	9.6	14.3
Need Better Public Relations/More Support/Communication	9.3	4.8	19.0	--	11.1	5.5	9.5
Philosophical Statements	8.0	--	4.8	8.0	11.1	8.2	4.8
Need Better Trained/More Specialized Personnel	8.0	--	--	12.0	--	4.1	14.3
Minority Language Groups Neglected	6.7	9.5	4.8	16.0	44.5	15.1	4.8
Failure of Centers to Meet Needs	5.3	23.8	23.8	12.0	--	12.3	4.8
Praise for Materials/Services of Centers	4.0	--	4.8	--	--	2.8	2.4
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Mentioned	75	21	21	25	9	73	42
Number of School Districts Responding	61	17	16	15	7	54	33

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

Personnel from about three fourths of the Title VII districts and half the non-Title VII districts had attended teacher training workshops and conferences sponsored by centers, most of them Title VII Centers. Project directors reported the centers had provided considerable useful information about the instructional materials available and how to make use of them in the classroom, and to a somewhat lesser extent, on how to develop materials.

Still, the most wanted additional service from centers was training in teaching methods. Most other desired services were related to materials and were similar to the answers given to a broader question on what is needed for improving the ways bilingual curriculum materials are developed and disseminated. Project directors wanted more information about available materials and greater access to them. Suggestions included distribution of sample copies, more centralized distribution, display materials at local centers and, especially, support for development and dissemination of local materials. As seen, much of the material in classroom use has been produced in local schools, but most of this material is used only in the district that produced it, with little distributed to other school districts. Besides greater development of local materials, other suggestions for materials development included the development of more culturally or locally relevant materials, more evaluations of materials and more materials in languages other than Spanish.

In all, the majority of the suggestions relate to the development of materials which are more ethnically or locally specific and to providing more information about existing materials, particularly those that are locally produced. Because none of the questions in the survey form focused on local production of materials in a way that would elicit comments in this area, these responses are highly significant. They will be dealt with in greater detail in the following chapter, Summary and Conclusions.

CHAPTER V: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As part of a larger study of federal support for the development and dissemination of bilingual curriculum materials, a survey of the directors of bilingual education projects at local school districts was conducted to determine: 1) their needs for additional instructional materials and 2) their perspectives on the dissemination of materials and services from the Network of Title VII Centers. Projects funded under Title VII and those funded by other sources were included in the survey. Overall, the survey indicated that there has been considerable contact with the Title VII Centers which was judged worthwhile, but that most of the instructional materials in use as well as information about them were obtained from commercial sources or developed locally. It also indicates that there was a substantial demand for additional materials in a wide variety of languages, grade levels, and subject areas.

Needs for Additional Materials

The needs for materials were studied against a background of the materials already being used in bilingual education classrooms. In analyses of this and other data for the report, the languages were grouped into five major categories: Spanish, Other European, Asian, Native American, and Other.

> Of the main instructional materials currently in use, most were textbooks in language arts subject areas for the elementary grades.

Textbooks made up over half the Spanish and Other European materials cited. The lower percentage of textbooks mentioned for Other language categories and the fewer number of items cited per project for the non-Spanish languages compared with Spanish was consistent with the more limited availability of materials in those languages. Language arts was the subject of over half the materials cited in all languages except Asian and Other. The preponderance of materials in all language categories was developed for the elementary grades. This was consistent with the distribution of students with limited English language skills (LELS) in the school districts. Generally, LELS are most numerous in the first grade and then decrease in each successive year.

> Commercial publishers and the local school districts developed most of the materials being used in classrooms and few materials produced by the Title VII Network were in use.

Materials for Spanish, European, and Other languages were mainly produced by commercial publishers, with foreign publishers accounting for most of the items.* Local school districts were the sources of most Asian and Native American materials. Commercial sources and local school districts each far surpassed Title VII Centers as sources of materials; less than five percent of all items mentioned as being in classroom use were produced by the Title VII Centers.

---

*Much of the material developed overseas was disseminated through U.S. distributors.

Materials were developed locally in over four-fifths of the Title VII language programs and over half the non-Title VII programs. The majority of these materials were teacher or curriculum guides or various types of supplementary materials. Most often they were for language arts at the elementary level. Only the Asian projects produced appreciable amounts of secondary school level materials.

> Most projects reported needing additional bilingual curriculum materials, with the materials most needed being much the same as the major items in use -- e.g., language arts texts for the elementary grades.

About three quarters of all Title VII language programs, except those in the Asian language category, reported needing bilingual education materials. The lower number of mentions of Asian needs is probably an artifact of the small number of Asian projects in the sample. Indeed, nearly half the expressed needs from respondents in the Asian and other non-Spanish language categories were for materials in "all subjects," and frequently in all types of formats for all grades. Most of the European and virtually all of the Asian, Native American, and other language projects reported that the items they needed were unavailable.

Considering the large amount of Spanish material on the market* and the large number of items cited as being used in Spanish programs, an unexpectedly high proportion of Spanish language projects reported needing materials. However, half the Title VII and two-fifths of the non-Title VII Spanish programs reported the types of materials they needed were available but unsuitable. Major reasons for unsuitability were inconsistency with school curricula, difficulty of language and cultural irrelevancy.

Improving the Materials Dissemination System

The second major objective of the study was to investigate the services provided by the Title VII Centers to the bilingual projects at local school districts. Particular attention was paid to the dissemination of information and materials and to the sponsoring of training and conferences for school personnel.

> There has been extensive and productive contact between bilingual education projects and the Title VII Centers.

Considerable use of the services available through the Title VII Centers, particularly with respect to information received about materials and attendance at training sessions and conferences, was reported. Indeed, personnel from about three-fourths of the Title VII districts and half the non-Title VII districts attended training conferences sponsored by bilingual centers, mainly Title VII Centers. Respondents reported that school staffs attending Title VII training workshops obtained considerable useful information about what instructional materials were available and on how to use them, but somewhat less information about how to develop materials.

---

* Development Associates, "A Study of the State of Bilingual Materials Development and the Transition of Materials to the Classroom" 1978 (A companion volume to this report).

> Commercial publishers and distributors far surpass the Title VII Centers as sources of bilingual education materials and information about them.

Although there has been fruitful contact between the bilingual projects and the centers, except for the Asian and Native American language projects, commercial publishers and distributors were cited as the primary source of information about bilingual education materials, and except for Asian projects, they were the prime sources of the materials as well. Overall, the bilingual education centers were mentioned as the most important source of materials by less than 15% of the respondents. Only the Asian language projects reported using substantial amounts of materials from Title VII Centers. However, for them the most important source of materials was their own school district.

> Training in teaching methods was cited most often as an additional service wanted from the bilingual education centers. There also were large numbers of requests for greater support for the development and distribution of local materials and for more information about existing materials and greater access to them.

More training in teaching methods from the centers was the most frequently requested additional service. The primary suggestion for improving the system of materials development and dissemination was for support for the local production of instructional materials. Almost all projects reported developing some materials locally and for many this was a major source. Relatively few projects, however, sent copies of what they developed to the Title VII Centers either for general information or dissemination to other locales.

Specific suggestions relating to obtaining information about existing materials included the distribution of sample copies, centralization of distribution (in order to simplify purchasing) and more local display. Whether locally or commercially developed, respondents wanted materials that were more culturally or locally relevant, more evaluations of available materials and more materials in languages other than Spanish.

Conclusions

From the perspective of the local school districts the needs for bilingual instructional materials have not been adequately met. In languages other than Spanish, there is a particularly great scarcity of available materials from any source. Even in Spanish, where many materials have been produced by both commercial publishers (mostly from Spain and Latin America) and Title VII Centers, many needs were cited. The importance of materials developed by local school districts is a further indication that available materials are in some ways insufficient.

What can be said definitively about the materials produced by Title VII Centers is that they are not being used widely in bilingual projects. This raises the question of whether the use of Title VII materials is limited because there is some objection to their content or because information about them has not been sufficiently disseminated. That is, is the problem in the materials themselves or in the system of distribution?

The data reflecting the substantial contact between the Centers and the school projects suggest that there has been ample opportunity for schools to learn about the existence of the Title VII materials. However, the responses calling for greater access to materials indicate that the brochures, catalogs, and other dissemination techniques may not be sufficient. Project personnel indicated they want to examine copies of the materials, and certainly the promotional efforts of the Title VII Centers do not compare with those of commercial publishers with their large sales staffs.

As for the materials themselves, respondents registered some displeasure with much which has been developed commercially as well as with much of what is available through the bilingual education centers. Although detailed reasons why available materials from these sources are not adequate for projects' needs cannot be obtained from this study, some insights do emerge.

The major qualitative criticism of available materials was that the language used was too difficult. In large part, however, this criticism may have been directed primarily toward the materials produced abroad. Although much of the Spanish and Other European language materials were obtained from U.S. distributors, most were actually developed overseas and contained language and descriptions of social contexts which are foreign to teachers and students in the U.S. With respect to the Title VII Centers, as discussed in the companion volume to this report, relatively few instructional materials have actually been produced. The largest set of such materials has been developed for Spanish programs, but they have been rejected in many school districts for being incompatible with their curricula and overly tailored to the district where their development began. Against these limitations of the existing commercial and Title VII materials the indication from many respondents that the kind of materials they "needed" were unavailable can be understood.

This too may explain why the respondents seem to have been asking that materials be more tailored to their particular area. Much effort has been devoted to developing materials locally and a demand for greater support of these activities was reported. Further, at least two of the three major reasons given for the unsuitability of available materials -- i.e., inconsistency with the curriculum and cultural irrelevancy -- suggest that respondents want their materials to be more individualized. On balance, the combination of these data and informal discussions with leaders in the field suggest that the demand for individualized materials is due in part to the objective scarcity of generally suitable materials but also in the case of some to the unrealistic expectations of bilingual program teachers and staff.

Regardless of the reason for the demand, however, local development of materials may be the only feasible approach, particularly for the Native American and other smaller language groups. Commercial publishers have shown that they will not undertake production of materials that cannot be expected to provide a substantial volume of sales. Indeed, even for Title VII Centers it has been impracticable to develop a range of materials for each of several language groups.

In spite of the pressures for local development of materials and the apparent willingness at the local level to respond, it may be compellingly argued, however, that because of the shortage of bilingual education teachers their time should not be diverted from the classroom to the development of materials. Further, teachers do not usually have the skills needed to create materials that are of high quality. Indeed, a recognition of this limitation was probably behind the request for more training in this regard.

In conclusion, then, when approaching the bilingual education market in the U.S. both the Title VII Centers and commercial publishers confront a highly diverse set of projects. While there is a demand for materials, the diversity of languages, program curricula and teaching styles make the prospects of filling the demand for most languages impractical commercially and difficult and expensive for the government. It is this basic market reality which explains why so little has been done. Its recognition also suggests a need to consider the most appropriate role and direction for the Centers, for commercial publishers, and for project staff in the years ahead.

CHAPTER VI: APPENDIX

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDING SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND USE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS

Some of the information gathered for this study was not included in the body of the report because it might have detracted from the discussions of the major issues. Additional tables have been included in this appendix for those interested in greater detail about the responding school districts and about use of bilingual education materials.

Characteristics of the School Districts and Bilingual Programs

Table A.1 provides a summary of various characteristics of the responding school districts and of their bilingual education projects. Table A.2 shows the years in which bilingual education projects were started. Analysis of the data indicated no relationship between the length of time projects had been operating and the amount of expenditures for materials or the type of funding. A distribution of the languages of bilingual projects by the Title VII Training Resource Center Regions is presented on Table A.3.

The next series of tables shows the distribution of students by grade levels. The numbers of students in the school districts with limited English language skills (LELS) is presented on Table A.4. Table A.5 shows the numbers of all students in bilingual programs, i.e., both those limited in English and those proficient in English. In most language categories, the numbers of students decline steadily after first grade. The smaller numbers in pre-kindergarten and kindergarten probably reflects the absence of those grades in some school districts.

Table A.7 gives the ratios of LELS students who are in bilingual programs to the total number of LELS in the districts. This ratio varies greatly among languages and among grades. Best served are the Spanish speaking students in elementary grades and the Title VII funded Native American students in elementary grades. Poorest coverage of bilingual programs is for the Asian and other language students.

On Table A.8 are the ratios of students with limited English language skills to all students in bilingual education programs. There has been controversy over whether bilingual programs are teaching students who are already proficient in English. The legislation allows participation "to a limited degree" of students whose language is English, but services are primarily reserved for those with limited English language skills. As seen here, the responding districts indicated that over three quarters of the students in most grades are not proficient in English. The proportion of LELS dips to a low between third and sixth grades, i.e., in the second half of elementary school. It generally rises somewhat in most languages in junior high and senior high school. Thus, students who are or who become proficient in English do not seem to be retained in bilingual education programs as they progress through the grades.

TABLE A.1

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS BY TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects	Other Projects
Median Number of Schools in District	13.6	8.6
Median Number of Schools with Bilingual Education Programs	4.7	3.6
Median Ratio of Schools with Bilingual Programs to Total Schools in District	.50	.40
Mean Number of Languages Addressed per District	1.78	1.41
Mean Number of Bilingual Projects Per District	1.36	1.05

TABLE A.2

YEAR IN WHICH BILINGUAL PROGRAMS WERE STARTED, BY TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects (N=145)	Other Projects (N=83)
1968 or before	3.5	4.8
1969	8.3	7.2
1970	12.4	6.0
1971	5.5	6.0
1972	11.7	7.2
1973	6.2	14.5
1974	20.7	19.3
1975	16.5	16.9
1976	12.4	7.2
1977	2.8	10.9
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE A.3

DISTRIBUTION OF LANGUAGES OF BILINGUAL PROJECTS BY TITLE VII TRAINING RESOURCE CENTER REGIONS

		LANGUAGES				
REGIONS	STATES	Spanish (N=217)	Other European* (N=51)	Asian (N=32)	Native American (N=27)	Other* (N=24)
1	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont	4.6	35.3	3.1	--	4.2
2	New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands	12.0	35.3	9.4	3.7	37.5
3	Alabama, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia	4.2	3.9	18.8	11.1	20.8
4	Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin	3.7	--	3.1	3.7	--
5	Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas	30.4	13.7	6.3	29.6	--
6	Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming	10.0	--	6.3	7.4	4.2
7	Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Trust Territories	33.2	11.8	37.5	22.2	25.0
8	Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington	1.8	--	15.5	22.2	8.3
TOTAL NUMBER		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

---

* French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

TABLE A.4

NUMBERS OF STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS, BY GRADE, LANGUAGE, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Language Grade	Number of Students from Title VII Projects						Number of Students from Other Projects					
	Spanish Language	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Langs.	Other Languages **	All Title VII Projs.	Spanish Language	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Langs.	Other Languages **	All Non-Tit.VII Projs.
Pre-Kindergarten	1,543	233	39	271	18	2,104	826	7	5	30	0	868
Kindergarten	16,464	2,120	797	764	1,325	21,470	8,016	186	41	475	42	8,760
First	18,869	2,328	808	931	3,375	26,311	8,090	183	55	577	51	8,956
Second	14,759	2,243	722	966	2,976	21,666	6,170	62	30	563	36	6,861
Third	13,867	2,159	730	813	2,848	20,417	5,099	74	26	621	30	5,760
Fourth	10,711	2,286	653	722	2,808	17,180	3,456	63	28	507	22	4,076
Fifth	9,123	2,022	655	697	2,700	15,197	3,239	63	24	665	37	4,028
Sixth	7,930	1,991	684	809	2,519	13,933	2,900	62	18	245	33	3,258
Seventh	6,353	2,022	579	644	2,581	12,179	2,851	73	16	216	30	3,186
Eighth	6,038	1,938	569	678	2,677	11,900	2,150	68	23	197	26	2,464
Ninth	5,558	1,913	675	586	1,478	10,210	1,920	72	9	197	18	2,216
Tenth	4,717	1,540	1,067	522	1,339	9,185	1,585	47	19	193	83	1,927
Eleventh	3,491	1,429	566	477	1,115	7,078	1,140	31	18	147	16	1,352
Twelth	2,784	1,399	432	373	989	5,977	735	28	14	163	9	949
Total Number of Students	122,207	25,623	8,986	9,253	28,748	19,4817	48,087	1,019	326	4,796	433	54,661
Number of School Districts Responding	114	48	71	22	34	--	92	15	17	5	13	105

---

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese.

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

TABLE A.5

TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY GRADE, LANGUAGE, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Language / Grade	Number of Students from Title VII Projects						Number of Students from Other Projects					
	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Pre-Kindergarten	1,293	356	18	56	1	1,724	550	179	0	55	0	784
Kindergarten	19,376	1,602	297	691	118	22,084	8,913	426	17	111	69	9,536
First	24,962	1,759	283	827	148	27,979	9,625	270	25	133	73	10,126
Second	20,357	1,598	267	846	116	23,184	8,238	49	22	143	67	8,519
Third	18,045	1,354	257	755	183	20,594	7,157	64	20	170	45	7,456
Fourth	13,623	1,192	267	654	187	15,923	4,151	51	20	65	53	4,340
Fifth	10,835	1,104	303	510	165	12,917	3,989	54	22	63	43	4,171
Sixth	7,324	876	334	467	97	9,098	3,377	62	21	87	29	3,576
Seventh	5,039	717	165	217	591	6,729	1,978	65	8	75	38	2,164
Eighth	4,945	817	205	209	605	6,781	1,302	44	8	79	38	1,471
Ninth	3,672	616	271	137	733	5,429	893	48	8	75	39	1,063
Tenth	2,724	399	568	130	92	3,913	545	35	7	83	65	735
Eleventh	1,958	219	243	122	95	2,637	506	15	8	68	65	662
Twelfth	1,358	147	184	79	88	1,856	513	14	9	66	67	669
Total Number of Students	135,511	12,756	3,662	5,700	3,219	160,848	51,737	1,376	195	1,273	691	55,272

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese.

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

TABLE A.6

NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY GRADE, LANGUAGE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Language / Grade	Number of Students from Title VII Projects						Number of Students from Other Projects					
	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Pre-Kindergarten	1,003	235	18	48	1	1,305	368	132	0	30	0	530
Kindergarten	12,633	1,116	207	617	107	14,680	5,606	291	9	80	48	6,034
First	15,611	1,232	216	707	141	17,907	6,136	174	17	65	52	6,444
Second	12,614	1,083	180	734	107	14,718	4,982	49	14	67	46	5,158
Third	11,098	918	167	605	173	12,961	4,078	63	13	85	23	4,262
Fourth	7,708	824	169	497	173	9,371	2,250	51	12	53	32	2,398
Fifth	5,809	829	224	416	157	7,435	2,062	53	15	49	22	2,201
Sixth	4,003	722	221	385	91	5,422	1,718	58	14	68	8	1,866
Seventh	2,949	572	68	217	565	4,366	1,529	58	5	65	11	1,668
Eighth	3,002	650	108	203	579	4,542	865	41	5	71	11	993
Ninth	2,754	503	228	134	701	4,320	531	44	5	69	12	661
Tenth	2,013	348	506	118	89	3,074	212	30	6	74	11	333
Eleventh	1,473	208	183	121	93	2,078	166	15	6	63	11	261
Twelfth	1,074	128	159	73	85	1,519	172	14	7	61	12	266
Total Number of Students	83,744	9,368	2,680	4,875	3,062	103,698	30,675	1,073	128	900	299	33,085
Number of School Districts Responding	115	39	24	21	14	162	86	10	4	2	2	104

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese.

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

TABLE A.7

MEAN RATIO OF STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH SKILLS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS TO TOTAL NUMBERS OF LIMITED ENGLISH STUDENTS IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY GRADE, LANGUAGE, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Language / Grade	Mean Ratio of Students from Title VII Projects						Mean Ratio of Students from Other Projects					
	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Title VII Projects	Spanish Languages	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Languages	Other Languages**	All Non-Title VII Projects
Pre-Kindergarten	.78	.40	.29	.25	.00	.34	.61	.00	.00	1.00	.00	.32
Kindergarten	.70	.51	.27	.70	.13	.46	.67	.56	.01	.27	.13	.33
First	.71	.50	.27	.69	.16	.47	.72	.67	.15	.35	.33	.44
Second	.73	.53	.27	.71	.17	.48	.70	.69	.19	.28	.17	.41
Third	.70	.50	.23	.71	.06	.44	.66	.62	.00	.33	.22	.37
Fourth	.67	.49	.27	.63	.14	.44	.49	.75	.06	.25	.25	.36
Fifth	.65	.53	.27	.63	.15	.45	.44	.65	.21	.25	.17	.34
Sixth	.58	.38	.27	.53	.11	.37	.36	.75	.29	.33	.00	.35
Seventh	.52	.40	.21	.41	.15	.34	.29	.63	.00	.50	.00	.28
Eighth	.52	.41	.23	.33	.16	.33	.26	.61	.00	.50	.00	.27
Ninth	.54	.31	.26	.28	.16	.31	.18	.55	.00	.50	.00	.25
Tenth	.51	.33	.29	.22	.20	.31	.11	.43	.00	.50	.00	.21
Eleventh	.47	.26	.30	.30	.17	.30	.11	.52	.00	.50	.00	.23
Twelfth	.48	.15	.34	.27	.17	.28	.08	.25	.00	.50	.00	.17

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese.

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

TABLE A.8

MEAN RATIO OF STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS TO TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECTS, BY GRADE, LANGUAGE, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Grade \ Language	Mean Ratio of Students from Title VII Projects						Mean Ratio of Students from Other Projects					
	Spanish Language	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Langs.	Other Languages **	All Title VII Projs.	Spanish Language	Other* European Languages	Asian Languages	Native American Langs.	Other Languages **	All Non-Tit.VII Projs.
Pre-Kindergarten	.82	.75	1.00	.86	1.00	.89	.69	.74	--	.54	--	.39
Kindergarten	.71	.75	.84	.90	.73	.79	.68	.88	.51	.70	.75	.70
First	.73	.76	.82	.84	.96	.82	.70	.93	.63	.51	.81	.72
Second	.71	.72	.78	.83	.96	.80	.68	1.00	.68	.52	.75	.73
Third	.69	.72	.76	.82	.95	.79	.67	.95	.77	.56	.75	.74
Fourth	.72	.72	.78	.79	.96	.79	.67	1.00	.51	.82	.75	.75
Fifth	.73	.80	.83	.80	.71	.77	.60	.93	.84	.78	.28	.69
Sixth	.73	.86	.77	.82	.96	.83	.60	.96	.77	.78	.28	.68
Seventh	.71	.86	.76	1.00	.99	.86	.76	.95	.62	.87	.29	.70
Eighth	.71	.82	.76	.97	.99	.85	.76	.97	.62	.90	.29	.71
Ninth	.82	.83	.83	.79	.98	.85	.71	.96	.62	.92	.31	.70
Tenth	.80	.94	.88	.76	.97	.87	.79	.91	.86	.89	.17	.72
Eleventh	.83	.97	.76	.93	.99	.90	.73	1.00	.75	.93	.17	.72
Twelfth	.85	.91	.87	.75	.98	.87	.68	1.00	.78	.92	.18	.71

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese.

**"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

Table A.9 below shows the numbers of students in each grade who are in English as a Second Language (ESL) programs that are not components of the bilingual education programs. That is, these are students who are receiving training in ESL only.

TABLE A.9

NUMBERS OF STUDENTS IN SEPARATE ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS
AT SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS,
BY GRADE AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects (W=92)	Other Projects (W=58)
Pre-Kindergarten	176	602
Kindergarten	3,455	1,332
First	6,536	1,170
Second	5,813	1,007
Third	5,100	867
Fourth	4,810	910
Fifth	4,282	409
Sixth	4,108	296
Seventh	4,587	347
Eighth	4,269	289
Ninth	3,450	205
Tenth	2,992	149
Eleventh	2,216	111
Twelfth	1,875	91
TOTAL Number of Students	53,669	7,785

Bilingual Education Materials

Tables A.10 through A.24 are cross tabulations of subject by grade of materials being used in classrooms, materials that were developed in the school districts, and additional materials that are cited as being needed. Each set of three tables presents materials used, developed, and needed by one of the five language categories. For example, Tables A.10, A.11, and A.12 provide this information for Spanish programs; Tables A.13, A.14, and A.15 provide the information for the Other European language programs. Following are Asian, Native American, and Other language categories.

In interpreting this data, care should be taken by the reader to note the small numbers in many of the cells, particularly on the tables for non-Spanish languages.

TABLE A.10

NUMBERS OF MATERIALS IN CLASSROOM USE IN SPANISH BILINGUAL EDUCATION BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathe-matics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathe-matics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	108	6	9	18	2	33	10	1	187	124	11	11	25	1	31	18	3	224
4-6	18	5	1	2	--	2	--	--	28	8	--	--	2	--	--	2	--	12
K-6	78	14	14	27	3	--	6	1	143	47	1	1	6	--	6	7	--	68
K-8	12	2	--	4	--	2	--	--	20	4	--	--	--	--	5	--	--	9
K-12	2	--	1	1	--	--	2	--	6	2	--	1	--	--	4	--	--	7
7-9	8	15	3	10	--	--	--	1	37	6	5	1	1	2	1	1	--	17
7-12	4	3	--	2	--	1	2	2	14	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
10-12	10	12	7	8	2	--	1	6	46	4	5	--	--	--	1	--	--	10
TOTAL	240	57	35	72	7	38	21	11	481	195	22	14	34	3	49	28	3	348

TABLE A.11

NUMBERS OF SPANISH BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS DEVELOPED AT SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	28	4	--	2	8	5	9	2	58	22	1	--	3	3	6	10	4	49
4-6	--	3	1	--	1	1	--	--	6	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
K-6	30	8	1	10	10	1	11	2	73	9	1	00	3	--	5	1	--	19
K-8	10	2	--	--	--	--	1	1	14	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5
K-12	3	3	1	2	1	2	2	--	14	3	1	--	--	--	1	1	--	6
7-9	1	4	1	3	--	1	2	2	14	--	3	2	1	--	--	--	1	7
7-12	3	2	--	--	--	--	--	2	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
10-12	1	6	5	5	3	--	1	2	23	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
TOTAL	76	32	9	22	23	10	26	11	209	40	9	2	7	3	12	12	6	91

TABLE A.12

NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL SPANISH BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS NEEDED BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. / Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	9	4	--	2	3	4	1	--	23	19	8	1	4	2	4	5	3	46
4-6	5	3	2	--	2	--	2	--	14	2	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	6
K-6	18	11	9	2	2	1	5	3	51	10	3	3	4	1	--	3	1	25
K-8	5	6	3	3	--	--	1	--	18	6	2	1	1	--	--	2	1	13
K-12	11	6	8	2	5	1	6	2	41	3	--	2	2	--	--	8	--	15
7-9	5	3	2	1	--	--	--	1	12	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
7-12	2	7	2	4	--	1	4	6	26	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	4	6
10-12	5	11	4	3	--	1	2	5	31	--	4	2	2	--	--	--	2	10
TOTAL	60	51	30	17	12	8	21	17	216	41	21	11	13	3	4	19	11	123

TABLE A.13

NUMBER OF OTHER EUROPEAN* BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS IN CLASSROOM USE BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	7	2	--	--	--	--	4	1	14	4	1	1	2	--	8	4	--	20
4-6	3	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	5	2	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	4
K-6	15	3	1	7	--	--	3	--	29	4	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	5
K-8	1	--	--	5	--	--	2	2	10	3	1	1	1	--	1	--	--	7
K-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
7-9	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	3	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	5
7-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	3
10-12	--	2	2	1	--	--	--	--	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	27	9	3	14	--	--	12	3	68	18	5	4	3	--	10	5	--	45

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

TABLE A.14

NUMBER OF EUROPEAN* BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS DEVELOPED AT SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	9	2	1	--	--	--	--	2	14	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	2
4-6	--	2	--	--	--	--	---	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-6	4	2	1	1	1	--	3	6	10	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	2
K-8	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-9	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-12	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10-12	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	1	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	15	9	4	2	1	--	3	10	44	1	--	--	1	--	2	--	--	4

---

* French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

TABLE A.15

NUMBER OF OTHER EUROPEAN* BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS NEEDED BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	2	--	--	--	--	--	4	1	7	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	2	4
4-6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--
K-6	5	3	--	--	2	--	5	--	15	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	3
K-8	1	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	3	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	1	3
K-12	4	2	--	1	--	--	9	1	17	--	--	--	--	2	1	3	--	6
7-9	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
10-12	--	1	1	2	--	--	2	1	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	13	7	1	4	2	--	23	3	53	1	2	1	--	2	1	7	3	17

*French/Greek/Italian/Portuguese

TABLE A.16

NUMBERS OF ASIAN BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS IN CLASSROOM USE BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Subj. / Grade	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	2	1	--	--	1	--	1	1	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4-6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-6	1	--	--	--	3	--	--	1	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--
K-8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10-12	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	4	1	--	--	4	--	1	2	16	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--

TABLE A.17

NUMBERS OF ASIAN BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS DEVELOPED AT SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	3	--	--	--	--	--	8	--	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4-6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-6	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	2
K-8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
7-9	--	2	--	2	1	--	--	--	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10-12	1	2	3	1	1	--	1	--	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	6	4	3	3	2	--	9	--	27	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	3

TABLE A.18

NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL ASIAN BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS NEEDED BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4-6	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-6	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-8	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-12	3	2	--	--	--	--	2	--	7	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	2
7-9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-12	--	1	1	--	--	--	1	--	3	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
10-12	--	--	1	--	--	--	3	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	7	3	2	--	--	--	9	--	21	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	1	4

TABLE A.19

NUMBERS OF NATIVE AMERICAN BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS DEVELOPED AT SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathe-matics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathe-matics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	5	2	--	--	1	--	--	--	8	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
4-6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-6	3	2	--	--	1	--	2	--	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-8	4	3	--	--	1	--	--	--	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-12	1	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
7-9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	13	7	--	--	4	--	3	--	27	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3

TABLE A.20

NUMBERS OF NATIVE AMERICAN BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS IN CLASSROOM USE BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	1	1	2	3	--	--	2	--	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
4-6	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-6	1	2	--	--	--	--	9	--	12	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
K-8	1	--	1	--	--	--	2	3	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-12	--	--	1	1	1	--	6	--	9	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	2
7-9	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10-12	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	4	4	4	4	1	--	20	4	41	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	4

TABLE A.21

NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL NATIVE AMERICAN BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS NEEDED BY GRADE, SUBJECT AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. / Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	7	2	--	1	--	--	1	--	11	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	2
4-6	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-6	9	--	--	2	2	1	5	--	19	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
K-8	2	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-12	2	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-12	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10-12	--	--	3	--	3	--	--	--	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	24	3	4	3	5	1	7	--	47	2	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	3

TABLE A.22

NUMBERS OF OTHER* LANGUAGE BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS IN CLASSROOM USE BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Subj. / Grade	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4-6	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-6	1	--	--	1	--	2	1	--	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-8	--	1	--	1	--	1	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-12	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-9	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-12	--	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10-12	1	4	5	4	--	1	--	2	17	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	4	7	8	7	1	5	1	4	37	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

TABLE A.23

NUMBERS OF OTHER* LANGUAGE BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS DEVELOPED AT SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
Subj. Grade	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	2	1	1	1	--	2	2	--	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4-6	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-6	3	1	--	4	1	1	1	--	11	--	1	1	--	--	1	--	--	3
K-8	2	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	5	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	2
K-12	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-9	1	2	1	--	--	1	1	--	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-12	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10-12	--	1	2	--	--	1	--	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	10	6	4	6	4	5	5	1	41	--	1	1	--	--	3	--	--	5

*"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.

TABLE A.24

NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL OTHER* LANGUAGE BILINGUAL EDUCATION MATERIALS NEEDED BY GRADE, SUBJECT, AND TYPE OF FUNDING

Subj. Grade	Title VII Projects									Other Projects								
	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total	Language Arts	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematics	Cultural Subjects	ESL	All Subjects	Other	Total
K-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4-6	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-6	--	1	--	--	1	1	1	1	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
K-8	4	1	--	--	--	1	2	--	8	1	--	--	1	--	--	2	--	4
K-12	--	--	--	--	--	2	4	--	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	--	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	4	2	--	1	1	4	14	1	27	1	--	--	1	--	--	2	--	4

*"Other" languages are listed in Table 6, page 20.